arXiv:1112.4024v2 [math.DS] 31 Aug 2012

ERGODICITY OF UNIPOTENT FLOWS AND KLEINIAN GROUPS

AMIR MOHAMMADI AND HEE OH

Abstract. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a non-elementary convex cocompact hyperbolic 3 manifold and δ the critical exponent of its fundamental group. We prove that a one-dimensional unipotent flow for the frame bundle of $\mathcal{M}$ is ergodic for the Burger-Roblin measure if and only if $\delta > 1$.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Ergodic properties of BMS and BR measures 8
3. Weak convergence of the conditional of $\mu_{E,s}^{\mathrm{BR}}$ 13
4. PS density and its non-focusing property when $\delta > 1$ 17
5. Energy estimate and L^2-convergence for the projections 19
6. Recurrence properties of BMS and BR measures 25
7. Window theorem for Hopf average 30
8. Additional invariance and Ergodicity of BR for $\delta > 1$ 37
9. BR is not ergodic if $0 < \delta \le 1$ 45
References 48

1. Introduction

In this paper we study dynamical properties of one-parameter unipotent flow for the frame bundle of a convex cocompact hyperbolic 3 manifold $\mathcal{M}$. When the critical exponent of the fundamental group $\pi_1(\mathcal{M})$ exceeds one, we show that this flow is conservative and ergodic for the Burger-Roblin measure m^{BR}: almost all points enter to a given Borel subset of positive measure for an unbounded amount of time. Such a manifold admits a unique positive square-integrable eigenfunction ϕ_0 of the Laplacian with base eigenvalue. Our result implies that a randomly chosen unipotent orbit, normalized by

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11N45, 37F35, 22E40; Secondary 37A17, 20F67.

Key words and phrases. Geometrically finite hyperbolic groups, Ergodicity, Burger-Roblin measure, Bowen-Margulis-Sullivan measure.

AM was supported in part by NSF Grant #1200388.

HO was supported in part by NSF Grant #1068094.

the time average of the eigenfunction ϕ_0, becomes equidistributed with respect to the Burger-Roblin measure.

To state our result more precisely, let $G = \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$, the group of orientation preserving isometries of the hyperbolic space $\mathbb{H}^3$. Let Γ be a non-elementary discrete subgroup of G which is *convex cocompact*, that is, the convex hull of the limit set of Γ is compact modulo Γ. Equivalently, $\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}^3$ admits a finite sided fundamental domain with no cusps. Convex cocompact groups arise in topology as fundamental groups of compact hyperbolic 3-manifolds with boundary.

The frame bundle of the manifold $\mathcal{M} = \Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}^3$, which is a circle bundle over the unit tangent bundle $\mathrm{T}^1(\mathcal{M})$, is identified with the homogeneous space $X = \Gamma\backslash G$. We consider the unipotent flow on X given by the right translations of the one-parameter unipotent subgroup

$$U = \{u_t := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ t & 1 \end{pmatrix} : t \in \mathbb{R}\}. \tag{1}$$

We are interested in the question when this flow is ergodic with respect to a natural invariant measure which will be introduced later on[1]. Since any one-parameter unipotent subgroup of G is conjugate to U, we are not losing any generalities by considering this U.

The answer to this question turns out to be dependent on the size of the critical exponent, δ, of Γ, which is equal to the Hausdorff dimension of the limit set of Γ [34]. When $\delta = 2$, X is compact ([36],[34]) and the classical Moore's theorem in 1966 [23] implies that this flow is ergodic with respect to the volume measure, i.e., the G-invariant measure. When $\delta < 2$, it can be shown that the volume measure is not ergodic any more. This raises a natural question of finding a substitute of a volume measure which is ergodic. Our main result in this paper is that when $\delta > 1$, the Burger-Roblin measure is conservative and ergodic, and is never ergodic otherwise.

The conservativity means that for any subset S of positive measure, the U-orbits of almost all points in S spend an infinite amount of time in S. Any finite invariant measure is conservative by Poincaré recurrence theorem. For a general locally finite invariant measure, the Hopf decomposition theorem [15] says that any ergodic measure is either conservative or totally dissipative (i.e., for any Borel subset S, $xu_t \notin S$ for all large $|t| \gg 1$ and a.e. $x \in S$). For $\delta < 2$, there are many isometric embeddings of the real line in X, by $t \mapsto xu_t$, giving rise to a family of dissipative ergodic measures for U.

We refer to the Burger-Roblin measure as the BR measure for short, and give its description using the Iwasawa decomposition $G = KAN$: $K = \mathrm{PSU}_2$, $A = \{a_s : s \in \mathbb{R}\}$, $N = \{n_z : z \in \mathbb{C}\}$ where

$$a_s = \begin{pmatrix} e^{s/2} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-s/2} \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } n_z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ z & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

---

[1] that is: any invariant Borel subset is either null or co-null.

Furthermore let M denote the centralizer of A in K.

The groups A and N play important roles in dynamics as the right translation by a_s on X is the frame flow, which is the extension of the geodesic flow on $\mathrm{T}^1(\mathcal{M})$ and N-orbits give rise to unstable horospherical foliation on X for the frame flow.

Fixing $o \in \mathbb{H}^3$ stabilized by K, we denote by ν_o the Patterson-Sullivan measure on the boundary $\partial(\mathbb{H}^3)$ associated to o ([26], [34]), and refer to it as the PS measure. The PS measure coincides with the δ-dimensional Hausdorff measure of the limit set of Γ. Using the transitive action of K on $\partial(\mathbb{H}^3) = K/M$, we may lift ν_o to an M-invariant measure on K.

Burger-Roblin measure Define the measure $\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}$ on G as follows: for $\psi \in C_c(G)$,

$$\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}(\psi) = \int_G \psi(k a_s n_z) e^{-\delta s} d\nu_o(k) ds\, dz$$

where ds and dz are some fixed Lebesgue measures on $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{C}$ respectively. It is left Γ-invariant and right N-invariant. The BR measure m^{BR} is a locally finite measure on X induced by $\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}$. It is an infinite measure except when $\delta = 2$, see [24] for a more general statement.

For Γ Zariski dense, Flaminio and Spatzier [10] showed that the BR measure is ergodic for the action of the full horospherical subgroup N. Roblin [31], extending the work of Burger [6], proved that the BR measure is the unique N-invariant ergodic measure on X which is not supported on a closed N-orbit, it is worth mentioning that Roblin work is much more general than the setting in hand.

The main result of this paper is

Theorem 1.1. *Let Γ be a convex cocompact subgroup which is not virtually abelian. The unipotent flow on X given by $U = \{u_t\}$ is ergodic with respect to the* BR *measure m^{BR} if and only if $\delta > 1$.*

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first and only known example of a non-trivial U-ergodic measure on the frame bundle of $\mathcal{M}$ when $\mathcal{M}$ is of infinite volume.

The proof of the ergodicity in the case $\delta > 1$ is substantially more complicated and much of the paper is devoted to that proof. We remark that we show the conservativity of the BR-measure for $\delta > 1$ without knowing its ergodicity a priori. Indeed we establish the non-ergodicity in the case $0 < \delta \leq 1$ by proving the failure of "sufficient" recurrence; see Section 9.

For a probability measure μ on X, the Birkhoff pointwise ergodic theorem (1931) says that the ergodicity of a measure preserving flow $\{u_t\}$ implies that the time average of a typical orbit converges to the space average: for any $\psi \in L^1(X)$ and a.e. $x \in X$, as $T \to \infty$,

$$\frac{1}{T}\int_0^T \psi(x u_t) dt \longrightarrow \int_X \psi\, d\mu. \tag{2}$$

A generalization of the Birkhoff theorem for an infinite locally finite conservative ergodic measure was obtained by E. Hopf [12] in 1937 and says that the ratio of time averages of a typical orbit for two functions converge to the ratio of the space averages: for any $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in L^1(X)$ with $\psi_2 \geq 0$ with $\int_X \psi_2 \, d\mu > 0$, as $T \to \infty$,

$$\frac{\int_0^T \psi_1(xu_t)dt}{\int_0^T \psi_2(xu_t)dt} \longrightarrow \frac{\int_X \psi_1 \, d\mu}{\int_X \psi_2 \, d\mu} \quad \text{a.e. } x \in X. \tag{3}$$

For our $X = \Gamma\backslash G$ with Γ convex cocompact and $\delta > 1$, there is a unique positive eigenfunction $\phi_0 \in L^2(\mathcal{M})$ for the Laplacian with the smallest eigenvalue $\delta(2-\delta)$ and with $\|\phi_0\|_2 = 1$, [34]. In the upper half-space coordinates, $\mathbb{H}^3 = \{z + jy : z \in \mathbb{C}, y > 0\}$ with $\partial(\mathbb{H}^3) = \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$, the lift $\tilde{\phi}_0$ of ϕ_0 to $\mathbb{H}^3$ is realized explicitly as the integral of a Poisson kernel against the PS measure ν_o (with $o = j$):

$$\tilde{\phi}_0(z + jy) = \int_{\xi \in \mathbb{C}} \left(\frac{(\|\xi\|^2 + 1)y}{\|z - \xi\|^2 + y^2} \right)^{\delta} \, d\nu_o(\xi).$$

The BR measure on X projects down to the absolutely continuous measure on the manifold $\mathcal{M}$ and its Radon-Nikodym derivative with respect to the hyperbolic volume measure is given by ϕ_0. In particular, if $\mathfrak{p} : X \to \mathcal{M}$ is the base point projection, we have $\int_X \phi_0 \circ \mathfrak{p} \, dm^{\mathrm{BR}} = \|\phi_0\|_2^2 = 1$.

We deduce the following from Theorem 1.1 and Hopf's ratio theorem (3):

Corollary 1.2. *Let $\delta > 1$.*

1. *For m^{BR} almost all $x \in X$, the projection of xU to $\mathcal{M}$ is dense.*
2. *For any $\psi \in L^1(X, m^{\mathrm{BR}})$ and for almost all $x \in X$,*

$$\lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{\int_0^T \psi(xu_t)dt}{\int_0^T \phi_0(xu_t)dt} = \int_X \psi \, dm^{\mathrm{BR}}.$$

We explain the proof of Theorem 1.1, in the case $\delta > 1$, in comparison with the finite measure case. This account makes our introduction a bit too lengthy but we hope that this will give a summary of the main ideas of the proof which will be helpful to the readers. The proof of Moore's ergodicity theorem is based on the following equivalence for a *finite* invariant measure μ: μ is ergodic if and only if any U-invariant function of $L^2(X, \mu)$ is constant a.e. Through this interpretation, his ergodicity theorem follows from a theorem in the unitary representation theory that any U-invariant vector in the Hilbert space $L^2(X, \mu_G)$ is G-invariant for the volume measure μ_G.

For an infinite invariant measure, its ergodicity cannot be understood merely via L^2-functions, but we must investigate all invariant bounded measurable functions. This means that we cannot depend on a convenient theorem on the dual space of X, but rather have to work with the geometric properties of flows in the space X directly. We remark that as we are working with a unipotent flow as opposed to a hyperbolic flow, the Hopf argument using the stable and unstable foliations of flows, which is a standard tool in studying the ergodicity for hyperbolic flows, is irrelevant here.

We use the polynomial divergence property of unipotent flows to establish that almost all U-ergodic components of m^{BR} are invariant under the full horospherical subgroup N. The N-ergodicity of the BR measure then implies the U-ergodicity as well. This approach has been noted by Margulis as an alternative approach to show the ergodicity of the volume measure μ_G in the finite volume case.

However, carrying out this argument in an *infinite* measure case is subtler. Indeed the heart of the argument, as is explained below, lies in the study of two nearby orbits in the "intermediate range". To the best of our knowledge, such questions in infinite measure spaces has not been understood before.

Let us present a sketch of the argument in the probability measure case. Let (X, μ) be a probability measure space. Then it is straightforward from (2) that for any generic point x, any $0 < r < 1$, and any $\psi \in C_c(X)$

$$\frac{1}{(1-r)T}\int_{rT}^{T} \psi(xu_t)dt \to \int_X \psi(x)d\mu. \tag{4}$$

Statements of this nature will be called a "window theorem" in the sequel.

We now explain how a suitable window theorem can be used in acquiring an additional invariance by an element of $N - U$. This idea was used by Ratner; see [29, 30] and the references therein. We also refer to [18, 19] where similar ideas, in the topological setting, were used by Margulis.

Let N^- and U^- denote the transpose of N and U respectively. Choose a sequence of generic points x_k and $y_k = x_k g_k$ inside a suitably chosen compact subset of X, moreover suppose $g_k \notin N_G(U)$ and $g_k \to e$, where $N_G(U)$ means the normalizer of U in G. Put $V^- = \left\{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & it \\ 0 & 1\end{pmatrix} : t \in \mathbb{R}\right\}$, and assume that the V^--component and the U^--component [2] of g_k are "comparable".

Flowing by u_t, we compare the orbits $x_k u_t$ and $y_k u_t = x_k u_t (u_t^{-1} g_k u_t)$. The divergence properties of unipotent flows (a simple computation in our case), in view of our above assumption on g_k's, says that the divergence of the two orbits is comparable to $u_t^{-1} g_k u_t$. Furthermore, the $(2,1)$-matrix entry of $u_t^{-1} g_k u_t$ dominates other matrix entries. Let $p(t)$ denote the $(2,1)$-matrix entry of $u_t^{-1} g_k u_t$. This is a polynomial of degree two whose leading coefficient has comparable real and imaginary parts. Therefore, the divergence of the two orbits is "essentially" in the direction of $N - U$. Choose a sequence of times T_k so that $p(T_k)$ converges to a non-trivial element $v \in N - U$. Letting $\epsilon > 0$ be small, since $p(t)$ is a polynomial, $y_k u_t$ remains within an $O(\epsilon)$-neighborhood of $x_k u_t v$ for any $t \in [(1-\epsilon)T_k, T_k]$. Hence the window theorem (4) applied to the sequence of windows $[(1-\epsilon)T_k, T_k]$ implies that $\mu(\psi) - \mu(v.\psi) = O(\epsilon)$ and hence $\mu(\psi) = \mu(v.\psi)$ as $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary.

---

[2] these components are well defined for all g_k close enough to e.

Repeating this process for a sequence of $v_n \to e$, we obtain that the measure μ is invariant under N.

We now turn our attention to an infinite measure case, assuming $\delta > 1$. There is a subtle difference for the average over the one-sided interval $[0, T]$ and over the two sided $[-T, T]$, and the average over $[-T, T]$ is supposed to behave more typically in infinite ergodic theory. We first prove that the BR measure m^{BR} is U-conservative based on a theorem of Marstrand [20], which allows us to write an ergodic decomposition $m^{\mathrm{BR}} = \int_x \mu_x$ where μ_x is conservative for a.e. x. Letting x be a generic point for Hopf's ratio theorem and $I_T = [-T, T]$, in order to deduce $\frac{\int_{I_T - I_{rT}} \psi_1(xu_t)dt}{\int_{I_T - I_{rT}} \psi_2(xu_t)dt} \sim \frac{\mu_x(\psi_1)}{\mu_x(\psi_2)}$, it is sufficient to prove that there is some $c > 0$ such that for all $T \gg 1$,

$$\int_{I_T - I_{rT}} \psi_2(xu_t)dt \geq c \int_{I_T} \psi_2(xu_t)dt. \tag{5}$$

This type of inequality requires strong control on the recurrence of the flow, and seems unlikely that (5) can be achieved for a set of positive measure, see [1, Section 2.4]. Hence formulating a proper replacement of this condition (5) and its proof are simultaneously the hardest part and at the heart of the proof of Theorem 1.1.

We call $x \in X$ a BMS point if both the forward and backward endpoints of the geodesic determined by x belong to the limit set of Γ. These points precisely comprise the support of the Bowen-Margulis-Sullivan measure m^{BMS} on X, which is the unique finite measure of maximal entropy for the geodesic flow, up to a multiplicative constant; see Section 2.3. We will call m^{BMS} the BMS measure for simplicity. By a BMS box, we mean a subset of the form $x_0 N_\rho^- A_\rho N_\rho M$ where $x_0 \in X$ is a BMS point, $\rho > 0$ is at most the injectivity radius at x_0 and S_ρ means the ρ-neighborhood of e in S for any $S \subset G$.

Theorem 1.3 (Window Theorem)**.** *Let* $\delta > 1$. *Let* $E \subset X$ *be a* BMS *box. Let* $\psi \in C_c(X)$ *be a non-negative function with* $\psi|_E > 0$. *Then there exist* $0 < r < 1$ *and* $T_0 > 1$ *such that for any* $T \geq T_0$,

$$m^{\mathrm{BR}}\{x \in E : \int_{-rT}^{rT} \psi(xu_t)dt \leq (1-r)\int_{-T}^{T} \psi(xu_t)dt\} > \tfrac{r}{2} \cdot m^{\mathrm{BR}}(E).$$

We call x a *good* point for the window $I_T - I_{rT}$ if

$$\int_{I_{rT}} \psi(xu_t)dt \leq (1-r)\int_{I_T} \psi(xu_t)dt,$$

or equivalently if $\int_{I_T - I_{rT}} \psi(xu_t)dt \geq r\int_{I_T} \psi(xu_t)dt$. The window theorem says that the set of good points for the window $I_T - I_{rT}$ has a positive proportion of E for all large T. It follows that for any $\epsilon > 0$, we can choose a sequence $T_k = T_k(\epsilon)$ such that the set E_k, of good points for the window $[(1-\epsilon)T_k, T_k]$ (or $[-T_k, -(1-\epsilon)T_k]$), has positive measure. Let $x_k, y_k = x_k g_k \in E_k$. To be able to use this in obtaining an additional invariance, we need to control the size as well as the direction of the divergence $u_{T_k}^{-1} g_k u_{T_k}$.

More precisely, we need to be able to choose our generic points $y_k = x_k g_k$ so that the size of g_k is comparable with $\frac{1}{T_k^2}$ and the size of its V^--component is comparable with that of U^--component.

We emphasize here that we work in the opposite order of a standard way of applying the pointwise ergodic theorem where one is usually given a sequence g_k and then find window I_{T_k} depending on g_k (as the window theorem works for any T_k). In our situation, we cannot choose T_k, and rather have to work with given T_k (depending on ϵ). So only after we know which T_k's give good windows for ϵ-width, we can choose good points $x_k g_k$ for those windows. What allows us to carry out this process is that we have a good understanding of the structure of the generic set along contracting leaves, to be more precise, because the BMS measure has positive entropy for the geodesic flow and that the PS measure is locally well-spread out.

Hoping to have given some idea about how the above window theorem 1.3 will be used, we now discuss its proof, which is based on the interplay between the BR measure and the BMS measure. It is worth mentioning that the close relation between the BR and the BMS measure is also the starting point of Roblin's unique ergodicity theorem.

Unlike the finite measure case, m^{BR} is not invariant under the frame flow, which is the right translation by a_s in X. However, as $s \to +\infty$, the normalized measure $\mu_s^{\mathrm{BR}} := (a_{-s})_* m^{\mathrm{BR}}|_E$ (the push-forward of the restriction $m^{\mathrm{BR}}|_E$ by the frame flow a_{-s}) converges to the m^{BMS} in the weak* topology.

Under the assumption $\delta > 1$, the BMS measure turns out to be U-recurrent and hence almost all of its U-leafwise measures are non-atomic. This will imply that the analogue of (5) holds for "most" of the U-leafwise measures of m^{BMS}.

The goal is to utilize this and the fact that μ_s^{BR} weakly converges to m^{BMS}, in order to deduce that many of the U-leafwise measures of m^{BR} must also satisfy (5). It is worth mentioning that in general it is rather rare to be able to deduce "interesting" statements regarding leafwise measures from weak* convergence of measures. One possible explanation for this is that the leafwise measures of a sequence of measures may change "very irregularly" as one moves in the transversal direction, e.g. approximation of Lebesgue measure by atomic measures.

We succeed here essentially because we have a rather good understanding of the N-leafwise measures of μ_s^{BR}. To be more precise, we can show (i) the N-leafwise measures of μ_s^{BR} change rather regularly, see Section 3, furthermore, (ii) the projection of an N-leafwise measure of μ_s^{BR} converges in the L^2-sense to its counterpart of m^{BMS} in most directions, see Section 5.1.

We emphasize that we establish the L^2-convergence of these measures, not merely the weak* convergence, and this is crucial to our proof; see the Key Lemma 5.11 and Section 7. The proof of this L^2-convergence requires a certain control of the energy of the conditional measures of μ_s^{BR} which is uniform for all $s \gg 1$. Our energy estimate is obtained using the following deep property of the PS measure: for all $\xi \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$ and for all small $r > 0$, $\nu_o(B(\xi, r)) \asymp r^\delta$ (with the implied constant being independent of ξ and r), together with the Besicovitch covering lemma. Lastly we remark that our proof of the window theorem makes use of the rich theory of entropy and is inspired by the low entropy method developed by Lindenstrauss in [16].

Acknowledgment We are very grateful to Tim Austin for numerous helpful discussions regarding various aspects of this project. We also thank Chris Bishop and Edward Taylor for helpful correspondences regarding totally disconnected limit sets of Kleinian groups.

2. Ergodic properties of BMS and BR measures

2.1. Measures on $\mathrm{T}^1(\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}^3)$ associated to a pair of conformal densities.

Let $(\mathbb{H}^3, d)$ denote the hyperbolic 3-space and $\partial(\mathbb{H}^3)$ its geometric boundary. We denote by $\mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^3)$ the unit tangent bundle of $\mathbb{H}^3$ and by π the natural projection from $\mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^3) \to \mathbb{H}^3$.

Denote by $\{g^s : s \in \mathbb{R}\}$ the geodesic flow. For $u \in \mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^3)$, we set

$$u^+ := \lim_{s\to\infty} g^s(u) \quad \text{and} \quad u^- := \lim_{s\to-\infty} g^s(u)$$

which are respectively the forward and backward endpoints in $\partial(\mathbb{H}^3)$ of the geodesic defined by u.

Definition 2.1.

(1) The Busemann function $\beta : \partial(\mathbb{H}^3) \times \mathbb{H}^3 \times \mathbb{H}^3 \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined as follows: for $\xi \in \partial(\mathbb{H}^3)$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{H}^3$,

$$\beta_\xi(x, y) = \lim_{s\to\infty} d(x, \xi_s) - d(y, \xi_s)$$

where ξ_s is a geodesic ray tending to ξ as $s \to \infty$ from a base point $o \in \mathbb{H}^3$, fixed once and for all.

(2) For $u \in \mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^3)$, the unstable horosphere $\mathcal{H}_u^+$ and the stable horosphere $\mathcal{H}_u^-$ denote respectively the subsets

$$\{v \in \mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^3) : v^- = u^-, \beta_{u^-}(\pi(u), \pi(v)) = 0\};$$
$$\{v \in \mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^3) : v^+ = u^+, \beta_{u^+}(\pi(u), \pi(v)) = 0\}.$$

Each element of the group $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ acts on $\hat{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ as a Mobius transformation and its action extends to an isometry of $\mathbb{H}^3$, giving the identification of $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ as the group of orientation preserving isometries of $\mathbb{H}^3$. Note that $(g(u))^\pm = g(u^\pm)$ for $g \in G$. The map $\mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^3) \to \partial(\mathbb{H}^3)$ given by $u \mapsto u^+$ is called the *visual* map.

For discussions in this section, we refer to [31] and [24]. Let Γ be a non-elementary (i.e., non virtually abelian) torsion-free discrete subgroup of G. Let $\{\mu_x : x \in \mathbb{H}^3\}$ be a Γ-*invariant conformal density* of dimension $\delta_\mu > 0$ on $\partial(\mathbb{H}^3)$. That is, each μ_x is a non-zero finite Borel measure on $\partial(\mathbb{H}^3)$ satisfying for any $x, y \in \mathbb{H}^3$, $\xi \in \partial(\mathbb{H}^3)$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma$,

$$\gamma_*\mu_x = \mu_{\gamma x} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d\mu_y}{d\mu_x}(\xi) = e^{-\delta_\mu \beta_\xi(y,x)},$$

where $\gamma_*\mu_x(F) = \mu_x(\gamma^{-1}(F))$ for any Borel subset F of $\partial(\mathbb{H}^3)$.

Let $\{\mu_x\}$ and $\{\mu'_x\}$ be Γ-invariant conformal densities on $\partial(\mathbb{H}^3)$ of dimension δ_μ and $\delta_{\mu'}$ respectively. Following Roblin [31], we define a measure $m^{\mu,\mu'}$ on $\mathrm{T}^1(\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}^3)$ associated to the pair $\{\mu_x\}$ and $\{\mu'_x\}$. Note that, fixing $o \in \mathbb{H}^3$, the map

$$u \mapsto (u^+, u^-, \beta_{u^-}(o, \pi(u)))$$

is a homeomorphism between $\mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^3)$ with $(\partial(\mathbb{H}^3) \times \partial(\mathbb{H}^3) - \{(\xi,\xi) : \xi \in \partial(\mathbb{H}^3)\}) \times \mathbb{R}$.

Definition 2.2. Set

$$d\tilde{m}^{\mu,\mu'}(u) = e^{\delta_\mu \beta_{u^+}(o,\pi(u))}\, e^{\delta_{\mu'}\beta_{u^-}(o,\pi(u))}\, d\mu_o(u^+)d\mu'_o(u^-)dt.$$

It follows from the Γ-conformal properties of $\{\mu_x\}$ and $\{\mu'_x\}$ that $\tilde{m}^{\mu,\mu'}$ is Γ-invariant and that this definition is independent of the choice of $o \in \mathbb{H}^3$. Therefore it induces a locally finite Borel measure $m^{\mu,\mu'}$ on $\mathrm{T}^1(\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}^3)$.

2.2. **BMS and BR measures on** $\mathrm{T}^1(\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}^3)$**.** Two important densities we will consider are the Patterson-Sullivan density and the G-invariant density.

We denote by δ the critical exponent of Γ, that is, the abscissa of convergence of the Poincare series $\mathcal{P}_\Gamma(s) := \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} e^{-sd(o,\gamma(o))}$ for $o \in \mathbb{H}^3$. As Γ is non-elementary, we have $\delta > 0$. The limit set $\Lambda(\Gamma)$ is the set of all accumulation points of orbits $\Gamma(z)$, $z \in \mathbb{H}^3$. As Γ acts properly discontinuously on $\mathbb{H}^3$, $\Lambda(\Gamma) \subset \partial(\mathbb{H}^3)$. Generalizing the work of Patterson [26] for $n = 2$, Sullivan [34] constructed a Γ-invariant conformal density $\{\nu_x : x \in \mathbb{H}^3\}$ of dimension δ supported on $\Lambda(\Gamma)$. Fixing $o \in \mathbb{H}^3$, each ν_x is the unique weak limit as $s \to \delta^+$ of the family of measures on the compact space $\overline{\mathbb{H}}^3 := \mathbb{H}^3 \cup \partial_\infty(\mathbb{H}^3)$:

$$\nu_{x,s} := \frac{1}{\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} e^{-sd(o,\gamma(o))}} \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} e^{-sd(x,\gamma(o))}\delta_{\gamma(o)}$$

where $\delta_{\gamma(o)}$ is the dirac measure at $\gamma(o)$. This family will be referred to as the PS density. When Γ is of divergence type, i.e., $\mathcal{P}_\Gamma(\delta) = \infty$, the PS-density is the unique Γ-invariant conformal density of dimension δ (up to a constant multiple) and atom-free [31, Cor. 1.8].

We denote by $\{m_x : x \in \mathbb{H}^3\}$ a G-invariant conformal density on the boundary $\partial(\mathbb{H}^3)$ of dimension 2, unique up to homothety. In particular, each m_x is invariant under the maximal compact subgroup which stabilizes x.

Definition 2.3.

(1) The measure $m^{\nu,\nu}$ on $\mathrm{T}^1(\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}^3)$ is called the Bowen-Margulis-Sullivan measure m^{BMS} associated with $\{\nu_x\}$ [35]:

$$m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(u) = e^{\delta\beta_{u^+}(o,\pi(u))}\, e^{\delta\beta_{u^-}(o,\pi(u))}\, d\nu_o(u^+)d\nu_o(u^-)dt.$$

(2) The measure $m^{\nu,m}$ on $\mathrm{T}^1(\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}^3)$ is called the Burger-Roblin measure m^{BR} associated with $\{\nu_x\}$ and $\{m_x\}$ ([6], [31]):

$$m^{\mathrm{BR}}(u) = e^{2\beta_{u^+}(o,\pi(u))}\, e^{\delta\beta_{u^-}(o,\pi(u))}\, dm_o(u^+)d\nu_o(u^-)dt.$$

We will refer to these measures as the BMS and the BR measures respectively for short. It is worth mentioning that the Riemannian volume measure, in these coordinates, is $m^{m,m}$.

A discrete subgroup Γ of G is called *geometrically finite* if a unit neighborhood of the convex hull $C(\Lambda(\Gamma))$ of the limit set modulo Γ has finite volume. It is equivalent to saying that $\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}^3$ admits a finite sided fundamental domain. A geometrically finite group Γ is called *convex cocompact* if one of the following three equivalent conditions hold (cf. [5]):

(1) $\Gamma\backslash C(\Lambda(\Gamma))$ is compact;
(2) $\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}^3$ admits a finite sided fundamental domain with no cusps
(3) $\Lambda(\Gamma)$ consists only of radial limit points: $\xi\in\Lambda(\Gamma)$ is radial if any geodesic ray ξ_t toward ξ returns to a compact subset for an unbounded sequence of t.

The BMS measure is invariant under the geodesic flow. Sullivan showed that for Γ geometrically finite, it is ergodic and moreover the unique measure of maximal entropy ([35], [25]). For Γ convex cocompact, the support of the BMS measure is compact, as its projection is contained in $\Gamma\backslash C(\Lambda(\Gamma))$.

Theorem 2.4. [10] *If Γ is geometrically finite and Zariski dense, the* PS *density of any proper Zariski subvariety of $\partial(\mathbb{H}^3)$ is zero.*

2.3. **BMS and BR measures on $X = \Gamma\backslash G$.** We fix a point $o\in\mathbb{H}^3$ whose stabilizer group is $K := \mathrm{PSU}(2)$. Then the map $g\mapsto g(o)$ induces a G-equivariant isometry between G/K and $\mathbb{H}^3$. Set

$$M := \{m_\theta = \mathrm{diag}(e^{i\theta}, e^{-i\theta}) : \theta\in[0,2\pi)\}.$$

By choosing the unit tangent vector X_0 based at o stabilized by M, G/M can be identified with the unit tangent bundle $\mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^3)$ via the orbit map $g\mapsto g(X_0)$. This identification can also be lifted to the identification of the frame bundle of $\mathbb{H}^3$ with G. These identifications are all Γ-equivariant and induce identifications of the frame bundle of the manifold $\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}^3$ with $\Gamma\backslash G$. We set $X=\Gamma\backslash G$. Abusing the notation, we will denote by m^{BMS} and m^{BR}, respectively, the M-invariant lifts of the BMS and the BR measures to X. For $g\in G$, we set $g^{\pm} = (gM)^{\pm}$ where $gM\in G/M = \mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^3)$. Note that the support of m^{BMS} and m^{BR} are given respectively by

$$\Omega = \{g\in X : g^+, g^-\in\Lambda(\Gamma)\} \text{ and } \mathcal{E} = \{g\in X : g^-\in\Lambda(\Gamma)\}.$$

The right translation action of the diagonal subgroup

$$A := \{a_s := \mathrm{diag}(e^{s/2}, e^{-s/2}) : s\in\mathbb{R}\}$$

on G is called the frame flow and it projection to G/M corresponds to the geodesic flow. We have that m^{BMS} is A-invariant and m^{BR} is A-quasi-invariant: $(a_{-s})_* m^{\mathrm{BR}} = e^{(2-\delta)s} m^{\mathrm{BR}}$.

Set

$$N := \{n_z = \begin{pmatrix}1 & 0\\ z & 1\end{pmatrix} : z\in\mathbb{C}\} \quad \text{and} \quad N^- := \{n_z^- = \begin{pmatrix}1 & z\\ 0 & 1\end{pmatrix} : z\in\mathbb{C}\}$$

and for $g \in G$,

$$H^+(g) := gN \quad \text{and} \quad H^-(g) := gN^-.$$

The restriction of the projection $G \to G/M$ induces a diffeomorphism from $H^+(g)$ (resp. $H^-(g)$) to the horosphere $\mathcal{H}^+_{gM}$ (resp. $\mathcal{H}^-_{gM}$) in $\mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^3)$ and hence the visual maps $u \to u^\pm$ induces diffeomorphisms $P_{H^+(g)} : \partial(\mathbb{H}^3) - \{g^-\} \to H^+(g)$ and $P_{H^-(g)} : \partial(\mathbb{H}^3) - \{g^+\} \to H^-(g)$ for each $g \in G$.

Definition 2.5. (1) On $H^+(y)$ for $y \in G$, set

$$d\mu^{\mathrm{Leb}}_{H^+(y)}(v) = e^{2\beta_{v^+}(o,\pi(vM))} dm_o(v^+).$$

The measure $\mu^{\mathrm{Leb}}_{H^+(y)}$ is G-invariant in the sense that $g_*\mu^{\mathrm{Leb}}_{H^+(y)} = \mu^{\mathrm{Leb}}_{g(H^+(y))}$; in particular, it is an N-invariant measure on $H^+(y)$.

(2) Set

$$d\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^+(y)}(v) = e^{\delta\beta_{v^+}(o,\pi(vM))} d\nu_o(v^+).$$

We note that $\{\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^+(y)}\}$ is a Γ-invariant family.

Fix a left G-invariant and right K-invariant metric on G which induces the hyperbolic distance d on G/K. For $\rho > 0$ and a subset Y of G, we denote by Y_ρ the intersection of Y and the ρ-ball centered at e in G.

The M-injectivity radius ρ_x at $x \in X$ is the supremum of ρ such that for $B_\rho := N^-_\rho A_\rho M N_\rho$, the map $B_\rho \to x_0 B_\rho$ given by $g \to x_0 g$ is injective.

Definition 2.6. A box in X (around x_0) refers to a subset of the form $x_0 B_\rho = x_0 N^-_\rho A_\rho M N_\rho$ with $0 < \rho < \rho_{x_0}$ for some $x_0 \in X$. Note that $x_0 B_\rho$ coincides with $x_0 N^-_\rho A_\rho N_\rho M$. We call this box a BMS box if $x_0^\pm \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$, i.e., if x_0 belongs to the support of the BMS measure.

We fix a box around $x_0 B_\rho$. Set $\tilde{T}_\rho := N^-_\rho A_\rho$ and $T_\rho := N^-_\rho A_\rho M$. Since the measures m^{BMS} and m^{BR} have the same transverse measures for the unstable horospherical foliations, we have for any $\psi \in C(x_0 B_\rho)$,

$$\begin{aligned} m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\psi) &= \int_{y \in x_0\tilde{T}_\rho, m \in M} \int_{n \in N_\rho} \psi(ynm) d\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^+(y)}(yn) d\tilde{\nu}_{x_0\tilde{T}_\rho}(y) dm \\ &= \int_{ym \in x_0\tilde{T}_\rho M} \int_{n \in N_\rho} \psi(ymn) d\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^+(ym)}(ymn) d(\tilde{\nu}_{x_0\tilde{T}_\rho} \otimes m)(ym) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\psi) &= \int_{y \in x_0\tilde{T}_\rho, m \in M} \int_{N_\rho} \psi(ynm) d\mu^{\mathrm{Leb}}_{H^+(y)}(yn) d\tilde{\nu}_{x_0\tilde{T}_\rho}(y) dm \\ &= \int_{ym \in x_0\tilde{T}_\rho M} \int_{n \in N_\rho} \psi(ymn) d\mu^{\mathrm{Leb}}_{H^+(ym)}(ymn) d(\tilde{\nu}_{x_0\tilde{T}_\rho} \otimes m)(ym) \end{aligned}$$

that is, $d\nu_{x_0 T_\rho} := d\tilde{\nu}_{x_0\tilde{T}_\rho} \otimes dm$ denotes the transverse measure of m^{BMS} (and hence of m^{BR}) on $x_0 T_\rho$.

The following easily follows from Theorem 2.4:

Corollary 2.7. *If Γ is geometrically finite and Zariski dense, and E is a box in X, then $m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\partial(E)) = 0$.*

2.4. **BR measure in the Iwasawa coordinates $G = KAN$.** The canonical map $\iota : N^- \to G/MAN = K/M$ has a diffeomorphic image $S := \iota(N^-)$ which is K/M minus a single point. By abuse of notation, we use the same notation ν_o for the measure on K which is the trivial extension of the PS measure ν_o on $\mathbb{S}^2 = K/M$: for $\psi \in C(K)$,

$$\int_K \psi \, d\nu_o = \int_M \int_S \psi(sm) \, d\nu_o(sX_0^-) dm$$

where dm is the probability Haar measure of M. The lift of the BR measure $\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}$ on G can also be written as follows (cf. [24]): for $\psi \in C_c(G)$,

$$\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}(\psi) = \int_G \psi(ka_s n_z) e^{-\delta s} d\nu_o(k) ds \, dz$$

where $ka_s n_z \in KAN$, ds and dz are some fixed Lebesgue measures on $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{C}$ respectively. As usual, this means that for $\Psi(\Gamma g) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \psi(\gamma g)$ with $\psi \in C_c(G)$, $m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Psi) = \tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}(\psi)$.

2.5. **BR measure associated to a general unipotent subgroup.** A horospherical subgroup N_0 is a maximal unipotent subgroup of G, or equivalently, $N_0 = \{g \in G : b^n g b^{-n} \to e \text{ as } n \to \infty\}$ for a non-trivial diagonalizable element $b \in G$. Since A normalizes N, it follows from the Iwasawa decomposition $G = KAN$ that any horospherical subgroup N_0 is of the form $k_0^{-1} N k_0$ for some $k_0 \in K$. The BR measure associated to N_0 is defined to be

$$m_{N_0}^{\mathrm{BR}}(\psi) := m^{\mathrm{BR}}(k_0.\psi)$$

where $\psi \in C_c(X)$ and $k_0.\psi(g) = \psi(gk_0)$. As m^{BR} is $M = N_K(U)$-invariant (here $N_K(U)$ being the normalizer of U in K), this definition does not depend on the choice of $k_0 \in K$. If U_0 is a one-parameter unipotent subgroup of G, its centralizer $C_G(U_0)$ in G is a horospherical subgroup. The BR measure associated to U_0 means $m_{N_0}^{\mathrm{BR}}$ for $N_0 = C_G(U_0)$.

2.6. **Mixing of frame flow and its consequences.** Some of important dynamical properties of flows on X have been established only under the finiteness assumption of the BMS measure. Examples of groups with finite BMS measure include all geometrically finite groups [34] but not limited to those (see [27]). Roblin showed that if $|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}| < \infty$, then Γ is of divergence type. In the following two theorems, we consider the groups Γ with $|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}| < \infty$. We normalize ν_o so that $|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}| = 1$.

Theorem 2.8 ([10], [31]). *Suppose that Γ is Zariski dense and $|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}| = 1$.*

(1) *The frame flow on X is mixing with respect to m^{BMS}, that is, for any $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in L^2(X, m^{\mathrm{BMS}})$, as $s \to \pm\infty$,*

$$\int_X \psi_1(ga_s)\psi_2(g) \, dm^{\mathrm{BMS}}(g) \to m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\psi_1) m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\psi_2).$$

(2) *The* BR *measure* m^{BR} *on* X *is* N*-ergodic.*
(3) *If* Γ *is geometrically finite,* m^{BR} *is the only* N*-ergodic measure on* X *which is not supported on a closed* N*-orbit.*

Flaminio and Spatzier [10] obtained (1) and (2) based on the work of Brin [3] and Rudolph [33] for Γ geometrically finite. However using the work of Babillot [2] and Roblin [31], it can be seen that the same proof works for any Γ with $|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}| < \infty$. (3) is shown by Roblin in [31] for the projection of measures on $\mathrm{T}^1(\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}^3)$ based on the mixing of the geodesic flow with respect to m^{BMS}. For Γ Zariski dense, using the mixing of the frame flow, his proof can be extended to prove (3) as well as the following theorem by verbatim repetition.

Theorem 2.9. [31, Thm. 3.4] *Let* Γ *be Zariski dense and* $|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}| = 1$*. Then for any* $\psi \in C_c(X)$ *or for* $\psi_i = \chi_{E_i}$ *for bounded Borel subsets* $E_i \subset X$ *with* $m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\partial(E_i)) = 0$*, as* $s \to +\infty$*,*

$$\int_X \psi_1(ga_{-s})\psi_2(g)\, dm^{\mathrm{BR}}(g) \to m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\psi_1)m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\psi_2).$$

We note that by the quasi-invariance of the BR measure,

$$\int_X \psi_1(ga_{-s})\psi_2(g)\, dm^{\mathrm{BR}}(g) = e^{(2-\delta)s}\int_X \psi_1(g)\psi_2(ga_s)\, dm^{\mathrm{BR}}(g).$$

In particular, the above theorem implies that if $\delta < 2$,

$$\int_X \psi_1(g)\psi_2(ga_s)\, dm^{\mathrm{BR}}(g) \to 0 \quad \text{as } s \to +\infty.$$

Lemma 2.10. *If* Γ *is a discrete subgroup of* G *with* $\delta > 1$*, then* Γ *is Zariski dense in* G*.*

Proof. Let G_0 be the identity component of the Zariski closure of Γ. Suppose G_0 is a proper subgroup of G. Being an algebraic subgroup of G, G_0 is contained either in a parabolic subgroup of G or in a subgroup isomorphic to $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{R})$. In either case, the critical exponent of G_0 is at most 1. This leads to a contradiction and hence $G_0 = G$. ☐

3. Weak convergence of the conditional of $\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,s}$

In this section, we suppose that Γ is a Zariski dense discrete subgroup of G admitting a finite BMS measure, which we normalize so that $|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}| = 1$.

Fix a bounded M-invariant Borel subset $E \subset X$ with $m^{\mathrm{BR}}(E) > 0$ and $m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\partial(E)) = 0$.

For each $s > 0$, define a Borel measure $\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,s}$ on X to be the normalization of the push-forward $(a_{-s}) * m^{\mathrm{BR}}|_E$: for $\Psi \in C_c(X)$,

$$\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,s}(\Psi) := \frac{1}{m^{\mathrm{BR}}(E)}\int_E \Psi(ga_{-s})\, dm^{\mathrm{BR}}(g).$$

Equivalently,

$$\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,s}(\Psi) = \frac{e^{(2-\delta)s}}{m^{\mathrm{BR}}(E)} \int_X \Psi(g)\chi_E(ga_s)dm^{\mathrm{BR}}(g).$$

Note that $\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,s}$ is a probability measure supported in the set Ea_{-s}.

The following is immediate from Theorem 2.9

Theorem 3.1. *As $s \to +\infty$, $\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,s}$ weakly converges to m^{BMS}, that is, for any $\Psi \in C_c(X)$,*

$$\lim_{s\to+\infty} \mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,s}(\Psi) = m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\Psi).$$

For simplicity, we will write for $x \in X$,

$$d\lambda_x(n) = d\mu^{\mathrm{Leb}}_{H^+(x)}(xn) \text{ and } d\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_x(n) = d\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^+(x)}(xn)$$

so that λ_x and μ^{PS}_x are respectively the conditional measures of m^{BR} and m^{BMS} on xN.

Definition 3.2. Fix $x \in X$. For $s > 0$, define a Borel measure $\lambda_{E,x,s}$ on xN_{ρ_x} as follows: for $\psi \in C_c(xN_{\rho_x})$,

$$\lambda_{E,x,s}(\psi) := \frac{e^{(2-\delta)s}}{m^{\mathrm{BR}}(E)} \int_{n\in N_{\rho_x}} \psi(xn)\chi_E(xna_s)d\lambda_x(n).$$

Recall the notation $T_\rho = N^-_\rho A_\rho M$ for $\rho > 0$. Let $x_0 \in X$ and let $\rho \le \rho_{x_0}$. For any box $x_0B_\rho = x_0T_\rho N_\rho$ and $\Psi \in C(x_0B_\rho)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,s}(\Psi) &= \frac{e^{(2-\delta)s}}{m^{\mathrm{BR}}(E)} \int_{x\in X} \Psi(g)\chi_E(ga_s)dm^{\mathrm{BR}}(g)\\ &= \frac{e^{(2-\delta)s}}{m^{\mathrm{BR}}(E)} \int_{x\in x_0T_\rho}\int_{n\in N_\rho} \Psi(xn)\chi_E(xna_s)d\lambda_x(n)d\nu_{x_0T}(x)\\ &= \int_{x\in x_0T_\rho} \lambda_{E,x,s}(\Psi|_{xN_\rho})d\nu_{x_0T}(x).\end{aligned}$$

Hence $\lambda_{E,x,s}$ is precisely the conditional measure of $\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,s}$ on xN_ρ.

The aim of this section is to prove:

Theorem 3.3. *Suppose that $x^- \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$ and $\rho < \rho_x$. For any $\psi \in C_c(xN_\rho)$,*

$$\lambda_{E,x,s}(\psi) \longrightarrow \mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_x(\psi) \quad \text{as } s \to +\infty.$$

The condition $x^- \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$ is needed to approximate the measure $\lambda_{E,x,s}$ by its thickening in the transverse direction.

For a function Ψ on X and $\epsilon > 0$, we define functions on X as follows:

$$\Psi^+_\epsilon(y) := \sup_{g\in\mathcal{O}_\epsilon} \Psi(yg) \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi^-_\epsilon(y) := \inf_{g\in\mathcal{O}_\epsilon} \Psi(yg)$$

where $\mathcal{O}_\epsilon$ is a symmetric ϵ-neighborhood of e in G. We also set

$$E^+_\epsilon := E\mathcal{O}_\epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad E^-_\epsilon = \cap_{u\in\mathcal{O}_\epsilon} Eu.$$

Lemma 3.4. *Let $x \in X$ and $0 < \rho < \rho_x$. For all small $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\epsilon_1 > 0$ such that for any non-negative $\Psi \in C(xT_{\epsilon_1} N_\rho)$ and any $t \in T_{\epsilon_1}$, we have*

$$e^{-\epsilon}\lambda_x(\Psi_\epsilon^-) \le \lambda_{xt}(\Psi) \le e^{\epsilon}\lambda_x(\Psi_\epsilon^+).$$

Proof. Let $0 < \epsilon < \rho_x - \rho$. Consider the map $\phi_t : xN \to xtN$ given by $\phi_t(xn) = xtn$, so that $\phi_t^* \lambda_{xt} = \lambda_x$. Since ϕ_t is a translation by $n^{-1}tn$, there exists $\epsilon_1 > 0$ such that for all $n \in N_\rho$ and $t \in T_{\epsilon_1}$, $n^{-1}tn \subset \mathcal{O}_\epsilon$ and the Radon-Nikodym derivative satisfies $e^{-\epsilon} \le \frac{d\lambda_{xt}}{d\lambda_x}(n) \le e^{\epsilon}$.

Therefore

$$\lambda_{xt}(\Psi) = \int \Psi(xn(n^{-1}tn))d\lambda_{xt}(n) \le e^{\epsilon} \int \Psi_\epsilon^+(xn)d\lambda_x(n) = e^{\epsilon}\lambda_x(\Psi_\epsilon^+).$$

The other inequality follows similarly. □

Lemma 3.5. *Let $x \in X$ and $0 < \rho < \rho_x$. For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\epsilon_1 > 0$ such that for any non-negative $\Psi \in C(xT_{\epsilon_1} N_\rho)$, any $t \in T_{\epsilon_1}$ and any $s > 0$,*

$$e^{-\epsilon}\lambda_{E_\epsilon^-, x, s}(\Psi_{2\epsilon}^-) \le \lambda_{E, xt, s}(\Psi) \le e^{\epsilon}\lambda_{E_\epsilon^+, x, s}(\Psi_{2\epsilon}^+).$$

Proof. Let ϵ_1 be as in Lemma 3.4. We may also assume that $n\mathcal{O}_{\epsilon_1}n^{-1} \subset \mathcal{O}_\epsilon$ for all $n \in N_\rho$.

For $t = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha & w \\ 0 & \alpha^{-1} \end{smallmatrix}\right) \in N^- AM$ and $n_z \in N$ with $\alpha + zw \ne 0$, define

$$\psi_t(z) = \tfrac{z^2 w + \alpha z - \alpha^{-1} z}{\alpha + zw} \quad \text{and} \quad b_{t,z} = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha + zw & w \\ 0 & \psi_t(z)w + \alpha^{-1} - zw \end{smallmatrix}\right).$$

Then by a direct computation, we verify that

$$tn_z = n_{z+\psi_t(z)} b_{t,z}. \tag{6}$$

Therefore we may assume that $\epsilon_1 > 0$ is small enough so that for all $t \in T_{\epsilon_1}$ and $n_z \in N_\rho$, we have $\{n_{\psi_t(z)} : n_z \in N_\rho\} \subset N_\epsilon$, $b_{t,z} \in T_\epsilon$, and the absolute value of the Jacobian of the map $\psi_t|_{N_\rho}$ is at most $\epsilon/2$.

We observe that $n_z a_s = n_{z+\psi_t(z)} a_s (a_{-s} b_{t,z} a_s)$ and since the conjugation by a_{-s} contracts $N^- A$ for $s > 0$, we have $n_z a_s \in n_{z+\psi_t(z)} a_s \mathcal{O}_\epsilon M$.

Since E is M-invariant, we deduce that $\chi_E(xtn_z a_s) \le \chi_{E_\epsilon^+}(xn_{z+\psi_t(z)} a_s)$ for all $t \in T_{\epsilon_1}$ and $n_z \in N_\rho$. Together with Lemma 3.4, we now obtain that for any $t \in T_{\epsilon_1}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{E,xt,s}(\Psi) &= e^{(2-\delta)s} \int_{n_z \in N_\rho} \Psi(xtn_z)\chi_E(xtn_z a_s) d\lambda_{xt}(z) \\
&\le e^{(2-\delta)s} \int_{n_z \in N_\rho} \Psi^+_\epsilon(xn_z)\chi_{E^+_\epsilon}(xn_{z+\psi_t(z)} a_s) d\lambda_{xt}(z) \\
&\le e^{\epsilon} e^{(2-\delta)s} \int_{n_z \in N_\rho} \Psi^+_\epsilon(xn_z)\chi_{E^+_\epsilon}(xn_{z+\psi_t(z)} a_s) d\lambda_{x}(z) \\
&\le e^{2\epsilon} e^{(2-\delta)s} \int_{n_z \in N_{\rho+\epsilon}} \Psi^+_\epsilon(xn_{z-\psi_t(z)})\chi_{E^+_\epsilon}(xn_z a_s) d\lambda_{x}(z) \\
&\le e^{2\epsilon} e^{(2-\delta)s} \int_{n_z \in N_{\rho+3\epsilon}} \Psi^+_{2\epsilon}(xn_z)\chi_{E^+_\epsilon}(xn_z a_s) d\lambda_{x}(z) \\
&= e^{2\epsilon} \lambda_{E^+_\epsilon,x,s}(\Psi^+_{2\epsilon})
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows since $N_{\rho+3\epsilon}$ contains $xN \cap \operatorname{supp}(\Psi^+_{2\epsilon})$. The other inequality can be proven similarly. □

Theorem 3.3 follows from:

Theorem 3.6. *Let $x^- \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$ and $\rho < \rho_x$. Let $\psi \in C(xN_\rho)$ be a non-negative function. For $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $s_0 \gg 1$ such that for any $s > s_0$,*

$$e^{-4\epsilon}\lambda_{E,x,s}(\psi) \le \mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_x(\psi) \le e^{4\epsilon}\lambda_{E,x,s}(\psi).$$

Moreover, if $x^+ \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$ and ψ is positive, then the above integrals are all non-zero.

Proof. Let ϵ_1 be as in Lemma 3.5. We note that as $x^- \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$, $\nu(xT_{\epsilon_1}) > 0$. Hence there exists a non-negative continuous function $\phi \in C(xT_{\epsilon_1})$ with $\nu(\phi) = 1$. Define $\Psi \in C(xT_{\epsilon_1}N_\rho)$ by

$$\Psi(xtn) := \psi(xn)\phi(xt) \quad \text{for } xtn \in xT_{\epsilon_1}N_\rho.$$

Set $\psi^+_\epsilon(xn) = \sup_{u \in N_\epsilon} \psi(xnu)$ and $\psi^-_\epsilon(xn) = \inf_{u \in N_\epsilon} \psi(xnu)$. Then by Lemma 3.5,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,s}(\Psi) &= \int_{xT_{\epsilon_1}} \lambda_{E,xt,s}(\Psi) d\nu_{xT_\rho}(xt) \\
&\le e^{\epsilon} \int_{xT_{\epsilon_1}} \lambda_{E^+_\epsilon,x,s}(\psi^+_{2\epsilon})\phi(xt) d\nu_{xT_\rho}(xt) \\
&= e^{\epsilon} \lambda_{E^+_\epsilon,x,s}(\psi^+_{2\epsilon}).
\end{aligned}$$

We can prove the other inequality similarly and hence

$$e^{-\epsilon}\lambda_{E^-_\epsilon,x,s}(\psi^-_{2\epsilon}) \le \mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,s}(\Psi) \le e^{\epsilon}\lambda_{E^+_\epsilon,x,s}(\psi^+_{2\epsilon}). \tag{7}$$

Since the map $t \mapsto \mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{xt}$ is continuous by [31, Lemma 1.16], we have

$$e^{-\epsilon}\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_x(\psi) \le m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\Psi) \le e^{\epsilon}\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_x(\psi)$$

by replacing ϵ_1 by a smaller one if necessary.

Since $\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,s}(\Psi) \to m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\Psi)$ by Theorem 3.1, we deduce from (7) that there exists $s_0 > 1$ such that for all $s > s_0$,

$$e^{-2\epsilon}\lambda_{E^-_\epsilon,x,s}(\psi^-_{2\epsilon}) \le \mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_x(\psi) \le e^{2\epsilon}\lambda_{E^+_\epsilon,x,s}(\psi^+_{2\epsilon}). \tag{8}$$

We claim that

$$e^{-4\epsilon}\lambda_{E,x,s}(\psi) \le \lambda_{E^\pm_\epsilon,x,s}(\psi^\pm_{2\epsilon}) \le e^{4\epsilon}\lambda_{E,x,s}(\psi) \tag{9}$$

which will complete the proof of the theorem by (8).

We can deduce from (7) that

$$e^{-\epsilon}\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E^-_{2\epsilon},s}(\Psi^-_{4\epsilon}) \le \lambda_{E^-_\epsilon,x,s}(\psi^-_{2\epsilon}) \le \lambda_{E^+_\epsilon,x,s}(\psi^+_{2\epsilon}) \le e^{\epsilon}\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E^+_{2\epsilon},s}(\Psi^+_{4\epsilon}).$$

Since it follows from Theorem 3.1 that

$$e^{-\epsilon}\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,s}(\Psi) \le \mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E^\pm_{2\epsilon},s}(\Psi^\pm_{4\epsilon}) \le e^{\epsilon}\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,s}(\Psi) \text{ for all large } s \gg 1,$$

we have

$$e^{-2\epsilon}\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,s}(\Psi) \le \lambda_{E^-_\epsilon,x,s}(\psi^-_{2\epsilon}) \le \lambda_{E^+_\epsilon,x,s}(\psi^+_{2\epsilon}) \le e^{2\epsilon}\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,s}(\Psi).$$

This implies $\lambda_{E^+_\epsilon,x,s}(\psi^+_{2\epsilon}) \le e^{4\epsilon}\lambda_{E^-_\epsilon,x,s}(\psi^-_{2\epsilon})$ and hence (9) follows. ☐

4. PS DENSITY AND ITS NON-FOCUSING PROPERTY WHEN $\delta > 1$

Let Γ be a (non-elementary) convex cocompact subgroup of G.

The assumption on Γ being convex cocompact condition is crucial for the following theorem:

Theorem 4.1. *For any compact subset F_0 of X, there exists $c_0 = c_0(F_0) > 1$ such that for any $x \in F_0$ with $x^+ \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$ and for all $0 < r \ll 1$,*

$$c_0^{-1}r^\delta \le \mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^+(x)}(xN_r) \le c_0 r^\delta$$

where $xN_r = \{xn_z : |z| < r\}$.

Similarly, for any $x \in F_0$ with $x^- \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$ and for all $0 < r \ll 1$, we have $c_0^{-1}r^\delta \le \mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^-(x)}(xN^-_r) \le c_0 r^\delta$ for $xN^-_r = \{xn^-_z : |z| < r\}$.

Proof. As F_0 is compact, up to uniform constants, $\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^+(x)}(xN^+_r) \asymp \nu_o(B(x^+, r))$ where $B(x^+, r)$ is the ball around x^+ of radius r in $\partial(\mathbb{H}^3)$ in the spherical metric. As $x^+ \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$, the above result is then due to Sullivan [35] who says $\nu_o(B(\xi, r)) \asymp r^\delta$ uniformly for all $\xi \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$ and for all small $r > 0$ for Γ convex cocompact. ☐

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\delta > 1$ and $F_0 \subset X$ be a compact subset. For every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a positive integer $d = d(\epsilon, F_0)$ such that for any $x \in F_0$ with $x^- \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$ and for all small $0 < r \ll 1$, we have*

$$\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^-(x)}\{xn^-_z : |z| < r,\ |\Im(z)| \le \tfrac{|\Re(z)|}{d}\} \le \epsilon \cdot \mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^-(x)}(xN^-_r).$$

Proof. Let r be small enough to satisfy Theorem 4.1. For an integer $d \geq 1$, consider $\mathcal{B}_d(x,r) := \{xn_z^- : |z| < r, |\Im(z)| < r/d\}$ which clearly contains the set in question. Theorem 4.1 implies that

$$\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^-(x)}(\mathcal{B}_d(x,r)) \leq c_0 \tfrac{d\cdot r^\delta}{d^\delta} = c_0 d^{1-\delta} r^\delta,$$

where $c_0 > 1$ is an absolute constant independent of d and r.

Let $d = d(\epsilon) \gg 1$ be such that $c_0 d^{1-\delta} < c_0^{-1}\epsilon$. Then $\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^-(x)}(\mathcal{B}_d(x,r)) \leq \epsilon \cdot \mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^-(x)}(xN_r^-)$, implying the claim. □

Lemma 4.3. *There exists $b_0 > 1$ such that for all small $0 < \eta \ll 1$*

$$N_{b_0^{-1}\eta} A_{b_0^{-1}\eta} N^-_{b_0^{-1}\eta} M \subset N^-_\eta A_\eta N_\eta M \subset N^-_{b_0\eta} A_{b_0\eta} N_{b_0\eta} M.$$

Proof. The claim follows since the product maps $N^- \times A \times N \times M \to G$ by $(n^-, a, n, m) \mapsto n^- anm$ and $N \times A \times N^- \times M \to G$ by $(n, a, n^-, m) \mapsto nan^- m$ are local diffeomorphisms at the identity. □

We will use the above results to prove the following proposition 4.4. The proof is elementary and is based on the fact we have a good control of the conditional measures on contracting leaves, i.e., N^--orbits. However, the fact that this statement holds is quite essential to our approach. Indeed, as we explained in the introduction, one major difficulty we face is that the return times for our U-flow do not have the regularity one needs in order to get the required ergodic theorem on the nose. In our version of the window theorem, the set where a window estimate holds depends on time; see Section 7, and in particular Theorem 7.7 below. Usually in arguments with similar structure as ours, this fact is fatal as one has very little control on the structure of the "generic" set for the measure in question. In our case however the following proposition saves the day and provides us with a rather strong control.

In the following proposition we fix a BMS box $E = x_0 N_\rho^- A_\rho N_\rho M$ with $x_0^\pm \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$ and $0 < \rho < \frac{1}{b_0} \inf_{x\in\Omega} \rho_x$ with b_0 as in Lemma 4.3.

Proposition 4.4. *Let $\delta > 1$. Fix $0 < r < 1$. There exist positive numbers $d_0 = d_0(r) > 1$ and $s_0 \gg 1$ such that for any Borel subset $F \subset E$ with $m^{\mathrm{BR}}(F) > r \cdot m^{\mathrm{BR}}(E)$ and any $s \geq s_0$, there exists a pair of elements $x_s, y_s \in F$ satisfying*

1. $x_s = y_s n^-_{w_s}$ *for* $n^-_{w_s} \in N^-$,
2. $\frac{1}{d_0 s} \leq |w_s| \leq \frac{d_0}{s}$ *and*
3. $|\Im(w_s)| \geq \frac{|\Re(w_s)|}{d_0}$.

Proof. Let $c_0 > 1$ be as in Theorem 4.1 where F_0 is the 2ρ-neighborhood of Ω. We will write $B(z,\rho) = zN_\rho^-$ in this proof. For all $x \in x_0 N_\rho A_\rho M$, $x^- = x_0^-$ and hence $x^- \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$. Hence by Theorem 4.1,

$$c_0^{-1}\eta^\delta \leq \mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^-(x)}(B(x,\eta)) \leq c_0 \eta^\delta \text{ for all } 0 < \eta < 1. \tag{10}$$

Set $d_1 := \frac{\nu(x_0N_{b_0\rho}A_{b_0\rho}M)}{m^{\mathrm{BR}}(E)}$ where ν denotes the transverse measure of m^{BR} on $x_0N_{\rho_{x_0}}A_{\rho_{x_0}}M$. We claim that there exists $z \in x_0N_{b_0\rho}A_{b_0\rho}M$ with $\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^-(z)}(B(z, b_0\rho) \cap F) > \frac{r}{d_1}$. Suppose not; then

$$m^{\mathrm{BR}}(F) \le \int_{z \in x_0N_{b_0\rho}A_{b_0\rho}M} \mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^-(z)}(B(z, b_0\rho) \cap F)\, d\nu(z)$$
$$\le \tfrac{r}{d_1}\nu(x_0N_{b_0\rho}A_{b_0\rho}M) = r \cdot m^{\mathrm{BR}}(E)$$

which contradicts the assumption on F.

Set $Q := B(z, b_0\rho) \cap F \cap \operatorname{supp}(\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^-(z)})$ and for each $s > 1$, consider the covering $\{B(x, s^{-1}) \subset H^-(z) : x \in Q\}$ of Q. By the Besicovitch covering lemma (cf. [21]), there exists $\kappa > 0$ (independent of s) and a finite subset Q_s such that the corresponding finite subcover $\{B(x, s^{-1}) : x \in Q_s\}$ of Q is of multiplicity at most κ.

Note that for $q > 1$, by (10),

$$\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^-(z)}(\cup_{x \in Q_s} B(x, \tfrac{1}{qs})) \le \kappa^2 q^{-\delta} c_0^2\, \mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^-(z)}(\cup_{x \in Q_s} B(x, \tfrac{1}{s})) \le \kappa^2 q^{-\delta} c_0^3 b_0^\delta \rho^\delta.$$

Hence by taking $q \ge 1$ large so that $\kappa^2 q^{-\delta} c_0^3 b_0^\delta \rho^\delta < \frac{r}{3d_1}$, we have

$$\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^-(z)}(\cup_{x \in Q_s} B(x, \tfrac{1}{qs})) < \tfrac{r}{3d_1}.$$

If we set $R(s, d) := \cup_{x \in Q_s}\{w \in B(x, \frac{1}{s}) : |\Im(w)| \le \frac{|\Re(w)|}{d}\}$, it follows from Lemma 4.2 that there exist $d_2 > 1$ and $s_0 > 1$ such that for any $s > s_0$,

$$\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^-(z)}(R(s, d_2)) < \tfrac{r}{3d_1}.$$

Hence for any $s > s_0$, the set

$$Q - (\cup_{x \in Q_s} B(x, \tfrac{1}{qs}) \cup R(s, d_2))$$

has a positive $\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^-(z)}$ measure (at least $\frac{r}{3d_1}$). In particular, there exists $x_s \in Q$ such that $(Q \cap B(x_s, \frac{1}{s})) - (B(x_s, \frac{1}{qs}) \cup R(s, d_2))$ has a positive $\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^-(z)}$ measure. Picking y_s from this set, we have found a desired pair x_s, y_s from F with $d_0 = \max(q, d_1)$. □

5. ENERGY ESTIMATE AND L^2-CONVERGENCE FOR THE PROJECTIONS

Let Γ be a convex cocompact subgroup of G with $\delta > 1$ and fix a BMS box $E \subset X$ (see 2.6 for its definition). We have $m^{\mathrm{BR}}(E) > 0$ and by Lemma 2.10 and Corollary 2.7, $m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\partial(E)) = 0$. In the entire section, we fix $x \in X$ with $x^{\pm} \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$. Recall the definition of the measure $\lambda_{E,x,s}$ on xN_{ρ_x} from (3.2): for $\psi \in C(xN_{\rho_x})$,

$$\lambda_{E,x,s}(\psi) = \frac{e^{(2-\delta)s}}{m^{\mathrm{BR}}(E)} \int_{n \in N_{\rho_x}} \psi(xn)\chi_E(xna_s)d\lambda_x(n).$$

In the following, we fix $0 < \rho < \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\rho_x$.

5.1. **Projections of $\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^+(x)}$ and $\lambda_{E,x,s}$.** The N-orbit of x can be identified with $\mathbb{R}^2$ via the visual map $xn \mapsto (xn)^+ \in \partial(\mathbb{H}^3) - \{x^-\}$ and the identification of $\partial(\mathbb{H}^3) - \{x^-\}$ with $\mathbb{R}^2$ by mapping x^- to the point at infinity. Therefore we may consider $\lambda_{E,x,s}$ and $\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^+(x)}$ as measures on $\mathbb{R}^2$.

Let

$$U = \{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ t & 1 \end{pmatrix} : t \in \mathbb{R}\}; \quad V = \{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ it & 1 \end{pmatrix} : t \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

In the sequel by a measure on $[0, 2\pi]$ we mean $d\theta/2\pi$. For each $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$, we set $U_\theta = m_\theta U m_\theta^{-1}$ and $V_\theta = m_\theta V m_\theta^{-1}$. We may identify U_θ as the line in $\mathbb{R}^2$ in the direction θ and V_θ as the line in the direction of $\theta + \pi/2$. We denote by p_θ the projection map $p_\theta : U_\theta V_\theta \to V_\theta$ which is simply the projection parallel to the line U_θ.

For $\rho > 0$, set

$$U_\theta^\rho := \{t \exp(i\theta) : t \in [-\rho, \rho]\} \text{ and } V_\theta^\rho := \{it \exp(i\theta) : t \in [-\rho, \rho]\}.$$

Definition 5.1. Fix $0 < \theta < \pi$, $0 < \tau \le \rho$ and $s > 1$. We define the measures on xV_θ^τ as follows: for $\psi \in C_c(xV_\theta^\tau)$,

$$\sigma^\tau_{x,\theta}(\psi) := \int_{xV_\theta^\rho U_\theta^\tau} \psi(p_\theta(y)) \, d\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^+(x)}(y),$$

and

$$\sigma^\tau_{x,\theta,s}(\psi) := \int_{xV_\theta^\rho U_\theta^\tau} \psi(p_\theta(y)) \, d\lambda_{E,x,s}(y).$$

That is, $\sigma^\tau_{x,\theta}$ and $\sigma^\tau_{x,\theta,s}$ are respectively the push-forwards of $\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^+(x)}|_{xV_\theta^\rho U_\theta^\tau}$ and $\lambda_{E,x,s}|_{xV_\theta^\rho U_\theta^\tau}$ via the map p_θ.

5.2. **Energy and Sobolev norms of the projections.** Consider the Schwartz space $\mathcal{S} := \{f \in L^2(xV_\theta) : t^\alpha D^\beta(f) \in L^2(xV_\theta)\}$, where $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $D = \frac{d}{dt}$. Denote by $\mathcal{S}'$ the dual space of $\mathcal{S}$ with the strong dual topology, which is the space of tempered distributions. For $r > 0$, we consider the following Sobolev space

$$H^r(xV_\theta) := \{f \in \mathcal{S}' : (1 + |t|)^r \hat{f} \in L^2(xV_\theta)\}$$

with the norm

$$\|f\|_{2,r} := \|(1 + |t|)^r \hat{f}\|_{L^2(xV_\theta)}$$

where $\hat{f}$ denotes the Fourier transform of f.

We recall the notion of α-energy:

Definition 5.2. For $\alpha > 0$ and a Radon measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^2$, the α-energy of μ is given by

$$I_\alpha(\mu) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{1}{|x - y|^\alpha} d\mu(x) d\mu(y).$$

It is a standard fact that $I_\alpha(\mu)$ can be written as

$$I_\alpha(\mu) = \alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^\infty \frac{\mu(B(x,r))}{r^{1+\alpha}} dr d\mu(x)$$

where $B(x,r)$ is the Euclidean disc around x of radius r.

The α-energy of a measure μ is a useful tool in studying the projections of μ in various directions. See [28, Proposition 2.2] or [22, Theorem 4.5] for the following theorem:

Theorem 5.3. *Let ν be a Borel probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^2$ with compact support. If $I_1(\nu) < \infty$, then $p_{\theta *}\nu$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure for almost all θ and for any $0 < r < \frac{1}{2}$,*

$$c^{-1} I_{1+2r}(\nu) \leq \int \|D(p_{\theta *}\nu)\|_{2,r}^2 d\theta \leq c\, I_{1+2r}(\nu),$$

where $c > 1$ is an absolute constant independent of ν, $D(p_{\theta *}\nu)$ is the Radon-Nikodym derivative of $p_{\theta *}\nu$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a compact subset, $c > 0$ and $\beta > 0$ be fixed. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a collection of Borel measures on Q such that*

$$\mu(B(x,\ell)) < c \cdot \ell^\beta \quad \text{for all } \mu \in \mathcal{M},\ x \in \operatorname{supp}(\mu) \text{ and } \ell > 0.$$

Then for any $0 < \alpha < \beta$,

$$\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}} I_\alpha(\mu) < \infty.$$

Proof. Fix $0 < \alpha < \beta$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \tfrac{1}{\alpha} I_\alpha(\mu) &= \int_Q \int_0^1 \frac{\mu(B(x,\ell))}{\ell^{1+\alpha}} d\ell d\mu(x) + \int_Q \int_1^\infty \frac{\mu(B(x,\ell))}{\ell^{1+\alpha}} d\ell d\mu(x) \\ &\leq c\ell^{\beta-\alpha}|_{\ell=0}^{\ell=1} \mu(Q) + \ell^{-\alpha}|_{\ell=1}^{\ell=\infty} \mu(Q)^2 = \mu(Q)(c + \mu(Q)). \end{aligned}$$

Now, since Q is compact, the assumption implies that $\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}} \mu(Q) < \infty$. Hence $I_\alpha(\mu)$ is uniformly bounded for all $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$. ☐

Corollary 5.5. *Fix $0 < \tau \leq \rho$. For almost all θ, $\sigma_{x,\theta}^\tau$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on xV_θ^τ and its support has a positive Lebesgue measure. Furthermore its Radon-Nikodym derivative satisfies $D(\sigma_{x,\theta}^\tau) \in H^r(xV_\theta^\tau)$ for any $0 < r < \frac{\delta - 1}{2}$.*

Proof. It follows from Theorem 4.1 and Lemma 5.4 that for any $0 < \alpha < \delta$, $I_\alpha(\mu_{H^+(x_0)}^{\mathrm{PS}}|_{x_0 N_\rho}) < \infty$.

Now, the fact that the support of the projection has positive measure follows from [20, Theorem I]. The other two claims follow from Theorem 5.3. ☐

Fix some $0 < r < \frac{\delta - 1}{2}$, for the rest of the argument. We will refer to these θ's which satisfy the conclusion of the above Corollary for this r as "PL" directions for (x, τ), or simply for τ when x is fixed.

5.3. **Uniform bound for the energy of $\lambda_{E,x,s}$, $s \geq 1$.** Set

$$\lambda^{\dagger}_{E,x,s} := \lambda_{E,x,s}|_{xN_\rho}$$

in this subsection.

In this subsection, we show that the collection $\mathcal{M} = \{\lambda^{\dagger}_{E,x,s} : s \geq 1\}$ of measures on xN_ρ satisfy the hypothesis of Lemma 5.4 with $\beta = \delta$. We may consider $\lambda_{E,x,s}$ as a measure on $\mathbb{R}^2$ supported on the ρ-ball around the origin.

Since E is a BMS box, E is of the form $x_0 N^{-}_{r_0} A_{r_0} N_{r_0} M$ for some $0 < r_0 < \rho_{x_0}$ where $x_0^{\pm} \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$.

Lemma 5.6. *For all $s \geq 1$, we have*

$$xN_\rho \cap Ea_{-s} \subset \{xn \in xN_\rho : d(xn, P^{-1}_{H^+(x)}(\Lambda(\Gamma) - \{x^-\})) \leq e^{-s} r_0\}$$

where $P_{H^+(x)} : \partial_\infty(\mathbb{H}^3) - \{x^-\} \to H^+(x)$ is defined in the subsection 2.3 and d denotes the Euclidean distance: $d(xn_z, xn_{z'}) = |z - z'|$.

Proof. Suppose $xn = x_0 n^-_w a_t n_z m_\theta a_{-s}$ with $|z| < r_0$. We may write it as

$$xn = x_0 n^-_w a_{t-s} m_\theta n_{e^{-s} e^{2\pi i \theta} z}.$$

If we set $y := x_0 n^-_w a_{t-s} m_\theta$, then $y^+ = x_0^+$. Hence $y^+ \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$. Since $xn = y n_{e^{-s} e^{2\pi i\theta} z}$ and $|e^{-s} e^{2\pi i \theta} z| < e^{-s} r_0$, the claim follows. $\square$

Theorem 5.7. *There exists $c > 0$ such that for all $s \gg 1$, $y \in \operatorname{supp}(\lambda^{\dagger}_{E,x,s})$ and any $\ell > 0$,*

$$\lambda^{\dagger}_{E,x,s}(B(y,\ell)) < c \cdot \ell^{\delta}$$

where $B(y,\ell) = \{yn_z : |z| < \ell\}$.

Proof. Since $B(y, 2\rho)$ contains xN_ρ, it suffices to show the above for $0 < \ell < 2\rho$. Since $\operatorname{supp}(\lambda_{E,x,s}) \subset Ea_{-s} \cap xN_\rho$, it follows from Lemma 5.6 that for each $z \in \operatorname{supp}(\lambda^{\dagger}_{E,x,s})$, $B(z, 3\rho e^{-s})$ contains $B(w, \rho e^{-s})$ for some $w \in H^+(z)$ with $w^+ \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$.

Hence by Theorem 4.1 we have

$$\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^+(z)}(B(z, 3\rho e^{-s})) \geq \mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^+(z)}(B(w, \rho e^{-s})) \geq c_0^{-1} (3\rho)^{\delta} e^{-\delta s}$$

where c_0 is as in Theorem 4.1 for F_1 the ρ-neighborhood of Ω. Consider the covering of $\operatorname{supp}(\lambda^{\dagger}_{E,x,s})$ given by the balls $B(z, 3\rho e^{-s})$, $z \in \operatorname{supp}(\lambda^{\dagger}_{E,x,s})$. By the Besicovitch covering lemma we can choose a finite set $J_s \subset \operatorname{supp}(\lambda^{\dagger}_{E,x,s})$ such that the corresponding finite collection $\{B(z, 3\rho e^{-s}) : z \in J_s\}$ has multiplicity at most κ (independent of s) and covers $\operatorname{supp}(\lambda^{\dagger}_{E,x,s})$.

Now we consider two cases for ℓ.

Case 1. $0 < \ell \leq e^{-s}$. Then for any $y \in \operatorname{supp}(\lambda^{\dagger}_{E,x,s})$, we have

$$\lambda_{E,x,s}(B(y,\ell)) \leq \pi e^{(2-\delta)s} \ell^2 \leq \pi \ell^{\delta}.$$

Case 2. $e^{-s} < \ell < 2\rho$. Let $J_{y,s} = \{z \in J_s : B(z, 3\rho e^{-s}) \subset B(y, 3\ell)\}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda^{\dagger}_{E,x,s}(B(y,\ell)) &\leq \sum_{z \in J_s} \{\lambda_{E,x,s}(B(z, 3\rho e^{-s})) : B(z, 3\rho e^{-s}) \cap B(y,\ell) \neq \emptyset\} \\ &\leq \sum_{z \in J_{y,s}} \lambda_{E,x,s}(B(z, 3\rho e^{-s})) \leq \sum_{z \in J_{y,s}} (3\rho)^2 e^{(2-\delta)s} e^{-2s} \\ &\leq c_0 (3\rho)^{2-\delta} \sum_{z \in J_{y,s}} \mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^+(y)}(B(z, 3\rho e^{-s})) \\ &\leq \kappa c_0 (3\rho)^{2-\delta} \mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^+(y)}(B(y, 3e^{-s})) \\ &\leq 3^{\delta} \kappa c_0^2 (3\rho)^{2-\delta} \ell^{\delta}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence for all $0 < \ell < 2\rho$ and $y \in \mathrm{supp}(\lambda_{E,x,s})$,

$$\lambda^{\dagger}_{E,x,s}(B(y,\ell)) \leq c_1 \ell^{\delta}$$

for some constant $c_1 > 0$ independent of $s \gg 1$. ☐

Therefore by Lemma 5.4, we deduce:

Corollary 5.8. *For any* $0 < \alpha < \delta$,

$$\sup_{s \gg 1} I_{\alpha}(\lambda^{\dagger}_{E,x,s}) < \infty.$$

5.4. L^2-convergence of projected measures.

Proposition 5.9. *Fix* $0 < \tau \leq \rho$ *and a PL-direction* $\theta \in M$ *for* (x, τ).

If $\sup_i \|D(\sigma^{\tau}_{x,\theta,s_i})\|_{2,r} < \infty$ *as* $s_i \to +\infty$, *then*

$$D(\sigma^{\tau}_{x,\theta,s_i}) \xrightarrow{L^2(xV_{\theta})} D(\sigma^{\tau}_{x,\theta}).$$

Proof. By Theorem 3.3 and the assumption of $x^{\pm} \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$, $\lambda_{x,s_i}|_{xU^{\rho}_{\theta}V^{\tau}_{\theta}}$ weakly converges to $\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^+(x)}|_{xU^{\rho}_{\theta}V^{\tau}_{\theta}}$ as $s_i \to \infty$. Therefore $\sigma^{\tau}_{x,\theta,s_i}$ weakly converges to $\sigma^{\tau}_{x,\theta}$ as $i \to \infty$. Hence it suffices to show that the collection

$$\{D(\sigma^{\tau}_{x,\theta,s_i}) \in L^2(xV^{\tau}_{\theta})\}$$

is relatively compact in $L^2(xV^{\tau}_{\theta})$. Since this collection is uniformly bounded in the Sobolev space $H^r(xV^{\tau}_{\theta})$ by the assumption, the claim follows from the fact that for any $r > 0$ we have $H^r(xV^{\tau}_{\theta})$ embeds compactly in $L^2(xV^{\tau}_{\theta})$ (see [17, Theorem 16.1]). ☐

Theorem 5.10. *Let* $s_i \to +\infty$ *be a fixed sequence. For every* $\epsilon > 0$ *and every finite subset* $\{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n\}$ *of* $(0, \rho]$, *there exists a Borel subset* $\Theta(x) \subset [0, 2\pi)$, *of measure at least* $1 - \epsilon$ *such every* $\theta \in \Theta(x)$ *is a PL direction for* (x, τ_{ℓ}), *for each* $1 \leq \ell \leq n$, *and satisfies*

$$D(\sigma^{\tau_{\ell}}_{x,\theta,s_{i_j}}) \xrightarrow{L^2(xV_{\theta})} D(\sigma^{\tau_{\ell}}_{x,\theta}) \qquad \text{for each } 1 \leq \ell \leq n$$

for some infinite subsequence $\{s_{i_j}\}$*(depending on* (x, θ)*).*

Proof. Recall that we fixed some $0 < r < (\delta - 1)/2$. By Corollary 5.8 and Theorem 5.3, there is a constant $L > 1$ such that

$$\sup_i \int \|D(\sigma^{\tau_\ell}_{x,\theta,s_i})\|^2_{2,r} d\theta \leq L \qquad \text{for } 1 \leq \ell \leq n$$

Hence using Corollary 5.5 and Chebychev's inequality we deduce that there exists some $L_0 > 0$ such that if we let

$$\Theta^{\tau_\ell}_{s_i} = \{\theta : \theta \text{ is a PL direction for } (x, \tau_\ell) \text{ and } \|D(\sigma^{\tau_\ell}_{x,\theta,s_i})\|^2_{2,r} < L_0\},$$

then for all $i > 0$, we have $m(\Theta^{\tau_\ell}_{s_i}) > 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2n}$. Let $\Theta_i = \cap_\ell \Theta^{\tau_\ell}_{s_i}$ and let $\Theta = \limsup_i \Theta_i$ then $m(\Theta) > 1 - \epsilon$. For $\theta \in \Theta$, θ lies in infinitely many of Θ_i's, say, $\theta \in \Theta_{i_j}$. Hence the claim follows from Proposition 5.9 applied to $\{s_{i_j}\}$. □

5.5. Key lemma on the projections of $\lambda^\dagger_{E,x,s}$.

The following is the key technical lemma in the proof of the window theorem:

Lemma 5.11 (Key Lemma). *Fix $0 < \tau < \rho$ and a PL direction $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$, simultaneously for (x, τ) and (x, ρ). Let $W_i m_\theta^{-1} \subset xN_\tau$ be a sequence of Borel subsets and $\{s_i\}$ be a sequence tending to infinity. Assume the following holds as i $\to \infty$:*

1. $D(\sigma^\tau_{x,\theta,s_i}) \xrightarrow{L^2(xV_\theta)} D(\sigma^\tau_{x,\theta})$;
2. $D(\sigma^\rho_{x,\theta,s_i}) \xrightarrow{L^2(xV_\theta)} D(\sigma^\rho_{x,\theta})$;
3. $\lambda_{E,x,s_i}(xN_\tau - W_i m_\theta^{-1}) \to 0$.

Then for any Borel subset $O_\theta(x) \subset xV^\rho_\theta$,

$$\limsup_i \sigma^\rho_{x,\theta,s_i}(O_\theta(x) - p_\theta(W_i m_\theta^{-1})) \leq \sigma^\rho_{x,\theta}\{t \in O_\theta(x) : D(\sigma^\tau_{x,\theta})(t) = 0\}.$$

Proof. Set $\mathcal{P}^\tau := \{t \in O_\theta(x) : D(\sigma^\tau_{x,\theta})(t) > 0\}$ and

$$\mathcal{L}^\tau_i := p_\theta(O_\theta(x) U^\tau_\theta \cap W_i m_\theta^{-1}) = O_\theta(x) \cap p_\theta(W_i m_\theta^{-1}).$$

For $n_0 > 1$, define

$$\Sigma_{n_0} = \{t \in \mathcal{P}^\tau : D(\sigma^\tau_{x,\theta})(t) \geq \tfrac{1}{n_0}, \;\; D(\sigma^\rho_{x,\theta})(t) < n_0\}.$$

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. There exists $n_0 = n_0(\epsilon) > 1$ such that

$$\sigma^\rho_{x,\theta}(\Sigma_{n_0}) > (1 - \epsilon)\sigma^\rho_{x,\theta}(\mathcal{P}^\tau).$$

Since $D(\sigma^\tau_{x,\theta,s_i}) \to D(\sigma^\tau_{x,\theta})$ in $L^2(xV_\theta)$, denoting by λ the Lebesgue measure on xV_θ, we have

$$|\sigma^\tau_{x,\theta}(O_\theta(x) - \mathcal{L}^\tau_i) - \sigma^\tau_{x,\theta,s_i}(O_\theta(x) - \mathcal{L}^\tau_i)| \leq \int_{xV_\theta} |D(\sigma^\tau_{x,\theta}) - D(\sigma^\tau_{x,\theta,s_i})| d\lambda$$

$$\leq \|D(\sigma^\tau_{x,\theta}) - D(\sigma^\tau_{x,\theta,s_i})\|_2 \cdot \lambda(xV_\theta)^{1/2} \to 0.$$

Since $\sigma^{\tau}_{x,\theta,s_i}(O_\theta(x)-\mathcal{L}^{\tau}_i) \le \lambda_{E,x,s_i}(xN_\rho - W_i m_\theta^{-1}) \to 0$ by the assumption on $W_i m_\theta$, it follows now that there is some $i_0 = i_0(n_0)$ such that for all $i \ge i_0$,

$$\sigma^{\tau}_{x,\theta}(O_\theta(x) - \mathcal{L}^{\tau}_i) < \tfrac{\epsilon}{n_0^2}.$$

Note that for any set $\Upsilon \subset \Sigma_{n_0}$ with $\sigma^{\tau}_{x,\theta}(\Upsilon) < \frac{\epsilon}{n_0^2}$, we have $\sigma^{\rho}_{x,\theta}(\Upsilon) < \epsilon$. To see this, note that if

$$\tfrac{1}{n_0}\lambda(\Upsilon) \le \int_\Upsilon D(\sigma^{\tau}_{x,\theta}, t) d\lambda(t) \le \tfrac{\epsilon}{n_0^2},$$

then $\lambda(\Upsilon) \le \frac{\epsilon}{n_0}$ and hence $\sigma^{\rho}_{x,\theta}(\Upsilon) = \int_\Upsilon D(\sigma^{\rho}_{x,\theta}, t) d\lambda(t) \le n_0 \lambda(\Upsilon) \le \frac{\epsilon}{n_0} \le \epsilon$.

Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sigma^{\rho}_{x,\theta}(O_\theta(x) - \mathcal{L}^{\tau}_i) \\
&\le \sigma^{\rho}_{x,\theta}((O_\theta(x) - \mathcal{L}^{\tau}_i) \cap \Sigma_{n_0}) + \sigma^{\rho}_{x,\theta}((O_\theta(x) - \mathcal{L}^{\tau}_i) \cap (O_\theta(x) - \Sigma_{n_0})) \\
&\le \epsilon + \epsilon \cdot \sigma^{\rho}_{x,\theta}(\mathcal{P}^{\tau}_\theta) + \sigma^{\rho}_{x,\theta}(O_\theta(x) - \mathcal{P}^{\tau}_\theta).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary,

$$\limsup_i \sigma^{\rho}_{x,\theta}(O_\theta(x) - \mathcal{L}^{\tau}_i) \le \sigma^{\rho}_{x,\theta}(O_\theta(x) - \mathcal{P}^{\tau}_\theta). \tag{11}$$

Now since $D(\sigma^{\rho}_{x,\theta,s_i}) \to D(\sigma^{\rho}_{x,\theta})$ in $L^2(xV^{\rho}_\theta)$, we have

$$|\sigma^{\rho}_{x,\theta}(O_\theta(x) - \mathcal{L}^{\tau}_i) - \sigma^{\rho}_{x,\theta,s_i}(O_\theta(x) - \mathcal{L}^{\tau}_i)| \le \int_{xV_\theta} |D(\sigma^{\rho}_{x,\theta,s_i}) - D(\sigma^{\rho}_{x,\theta})| d\lambda \to 0.$$

Combined with (11), this implies that

$$\limsup_i \sigma^{\rho}_{x,\theta,s_i}(O_\theta(x) - \mathcal{L}^{\tau}_i) \le \sigma^{\rho}_{x,\theta}(O_\theta(x) - \mathcal{P}^{\tau}_\theta).$$

□

6. Recurrence properties of BMS and BR measures

6.1. **Theorems of Marstrand on Hausdorff measures.** Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. The s-dimensional Hausdorff measure of Λ is defined to be

$$\mathcal{H}^s(\Lambda) = \inf_{\eta \downarrow 0} \mathcal{H}^s_\eta(\Lambda),$$

where $\mathcal{H}^s_\eta(\Lambda) := \{\sum_i d(W_i)^s : \Lambda \subset \cup_{i=1}^\infty W_i,\ \ d(W_i) \le \eta\}$ and $d(W_i)$ denotes the diameter of W_i.

The Hausdorff dimension of Λ is

$$\dim(\Lambda) = \sup\{s : \mathcal{H}^s(\Lambda) > 0\} = \inf\{s : \mathcal{H}^s(\Lambda) = \infty\}.$$

A set Λ is called an s-set if $0 < \mathcal{H}^s(\Lambda) < \infty$. Following Marstrand [20], a point $\xi \in \Lambda$ is called a condensation point for Λ if ξ is a limit point from $(\xi, \theta) \cap \Lambda$ for almost all θ where (ξ, θ) denotes the ray through ξ lying in the direction θ.

Let Λ be an s-set in the following three theorems:

Theorem 6.1. [20, Theorem 7.2] *If $s > 1$, $\mathcal{H}^s$-almost all points in Λ are condensation points for Λ.*

Theorem 6.2. [20, Lemma 19] *If $s > 1$, almost every lines L through $\mathcal{H}^s$-almost all points in Λ intersect Λ in a set of dimension $s - 1$.*

Theorem 6.3. [20, Theorem II] *If $s \leq 1$, then the projections of Λ have Hausdorff dimension s for almost all directions.*

6.2. **U-Conservativity of m^{BR}.** In the rest of this section, we assume that Γ is convex cocompact.

Theorem 6.4. [35] *For $x \in G$, the measure $\mu^{\text{PS}}_{H^+(x)}$ on xN is a δ-dimensional Hausdorff measure supported on the the set $\{xn \in H^+(x) : (xn)^+ \in \Lambda(\Gamma)\}$. Furthermore, this is a positive and locally finite measure on xN.*

For $U = \{u_t = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ t & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$, recall that U is conservative for m^{BR} if for every $\psi > 0$, $\int_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \psi(xu_t)dt = \infty$ for a.e. $x \in X$, or equivalently for any Borel subset B of X with $m^{\text{BR}}(B) > 0$, $\int_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \chi_B(xu_t)dt = \infty$ for a.e. $x \in B$.

The following is Maharam's recurrence theorem (cf. [1, 1.1.7]):

Lemma 6.5. *If there is a measurable subset $B \subset X$ with $0 < m^{\text{BR}}(B) < \infty$ such that for almost all $x \in X$, $\int_0^\infty \chi_B(xu_t)dt = \infty$, then U is conservative for m^{BR}.*

Recall the notation $\Omega = \{x \in X : x^\pm \in \Lambda(\Gamma)\}$ and $\mathcal{E} = \{x \in X : x^- \in \Lambda(\Gamma)\}$.

Theorem 6.6. *If $\delta > 1$, then U is conservative for m^{BR}.*

Proof. Set

$$\mathcal{F} := \{g \in X : g^- \in \Lambda(\Gamma), gu_t \notin \Omega \text{ for all large } t \gg_g 1\ \}.$$

Hence $g \in \mathcal{F}$ means $(gu_t)^+ \notin \Lambda(\Gamma)$ for all large $t \gg_g 1$. We claim that

$$m^{\text{BR}}(\mathcal{F}) = 0. \tag{12}$$

Suppose not. Then by the Fubini theorem, there is a set $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{E}$ with $m^{\text{BR}}(\mathcal{O}) > 0$ such that for all $g \in \mathcal{O}$, $gm_\theta \in \mathcal{F}$ for a positive measurable subset of θ's. Note that $\nu_o(\{g^- \in \Lambda(\Gamma) : g \in \mathcal{O}\}) > 0$ where ν_o is the PS measure on $\Lambda(\Gamma)$. Fix $\xi_0 \notin \Lambda(\Gamma)$ and identify $\partial(\mathbb{H}^3) - \{\xi_0\}$ with $\mathbb{R}^2$. Since $\nu_o|_{\partial(\mathbb{H}^3)-\{\xi_0\}}$ is equivalent to the δ-dimensional Hausdorff measure $\mathcal{H}^\delta$ on $\Lambda(\Gamma) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ by Theorem 6.4, we have $\mathcal{H}^\delta\{g^- \in \Lambda(\Gamma) : g \in \mathcal{O}\} > 0$. Note that $L_\theta(g) := \{(gm_\theta u_t)^+ \in \mathbb{R}^2 = \partial(\mathbb{H}^3) - \{\xi\} : t \geq 0\}$ is the line segment connecting g^+ (at $t = 0$) and g^- (at $t = \infty$). Hence $g \in \mathcal{O}$ implies that g^- is not a limit point of the intersection $L_\theta(g) \cap \Lambda(\Gamma)$ for a positive set of directions θ. This contradicts Theorem 6.1 and proves the claim (12).

Let $\mathcal{O}$ be an r-neighborhood of Ω for some small $r > 0$. If $g \in X - \mathcal{F}$, then $gu_t \in \Omega$ and $gu_{t+s} \in \mathcal{O}$ for all $|s| < r$. Hence if $gu_{t_i} \in \Omega$ for an unbounded sequence t_i, $\int_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \chi_{\mathcal{O}}(gu_t)dt = \infty$. As $m^{\text{BR}}(\mathcal{F}) = 0$ and $0 < m^{\text{BR}}(\mathcal{O}) < \infty$, this implies the conservativity by Lemma 6.5. $\square$

6.3. **Leafwise measures.** Let W be a closed connected subgroup of N. Let $\mathcal{M}_\infty(W)$ denote the space of locally finite measures on W with the smallest topology so that the map $\nu \mapsto \int \psi \, d\nu$ is continuous for all $\psi \in C_c(W)$ (the weak* topology). A locally finite Borel measure μ on X gives rise to a system of locally finite measures $[\mu_x^W] \in \mathcal{M}_\infty(W)$, unique up to normalization, called the leafwise measures or conditional measures on W-orbits. There is no canonical way of normalizing these measure, for our purposes here, we fix a normalization so that $\mu_x^W(N_1 \cap W) = 1$. With this normalization, the assignment $x \mapsto \mu_x^W$, is a Borel map, furthermore, for a full measure subset X' of X, $\mu_{xu}^W = u.\mu_x^W$ for every $x, xu \in X'$; for a comprehensive account on leafwise measures we refer the reader to [8].

In the case when $W = N$, $\mu_{H^+(x)}^{\mathrm{PS}} = \mu_x^{\mathrm{PS}}$ and $\mu_{H^+(x)}^{\mathrm{Leb}} = \lambda_x$, up to normalization are precisely the N-leafwise measures of BMS and BR measure respectively. We will be considering the U leafwise measures of m^{BMS} as well as of $\mu_{E,s}^{\mathrm{BR}}$.

We will use the following simple lemma.

Lemma 6.7. *Let μ be a locally finite M-invariant measure on X. For any $0 < \tau \ll 1$, and any $0 \le \theta < \pi$ we have*

$$|\mu_{xm_\theta}^{U^\tau}| = |\mu_x^{U_\theta^\tau}|$$

for μ almost every $x \in X$.

Proof. Since μ is M-invariant, for $T_\rho = A_\rho N_\rho^- M_\rho$, we have

$$\frac{|\mu_x^{U_\theta^\tau}|}{|\mu_{xm_\theta}^{U^\tau}|} = \lim_{\rho \to 0} \frac{\mu(xm_\theta U^\tau m_\theta^{-1}(m_\theta V_\rho T_\rho m_\theta^{-1}))}{\mu(xm_\theta U^\tau (V_\rho T_\rho))} = 1.$$

□

6.4. **Recurrence for m^{BMS}.** Since the frame flow is mixing by Theorem 2.8 with respect to m^{BMS}, we have:

Proposition 6.8. *For any non-trivial $a \in A$, m^{BMS} is a-ergodic.*

Theorem 6.9. *Let $\delta > 1$. For almost all $x \in \Omega$, $(m^{\mathrm{BMS}})_x^U$ is atom-free.*

Proof. Setting $\mathcal{F} := \{x \in \Omega : (m^{\mathrm{BMS}})_x^U \text{ has an atom}\}$, we first claim that $m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\mathcal{F}) = 0$. Suppose not. Fix any non-trivial $a \in A$. Since U is normalized by a, $\mathcal{F}$ is a-invariant. Hence $m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\mathcal{F}) = 1$ by Proposition 6.8. Using the Poincare recurrence theorem, it can be shown that

$$\mathcal{F}' := \{x \in \Omega : (m^{\mathrm{BMS}})_x^U \text{ is the dirac measure at } e\}$$

has a full measure in Ω (cf. [14], [16, Theorem 7.6]).

Since for any $x \in \Omega$, μ_x^{PS} is a positive δ-dimensional Hausdorff measure on $\{xn \in H^+(x) : (xn)^+ \in \Lambda(\Gamma)\}$ by Theorem 6.4 and $(m^{\mathrm{BMS}})_x^U = (\mu_{H^+(x)}^{\mathrm{PS}})_x^U$ for almost all $x \in \Omega$, it follows that for almost all $x \in \Omega$, $(\mu_{H^+(x)}^{\mathrm{PS}})_x^U$ is the dirac measure at e. By the Fubini theorem, there exists $x \in \Omega$ and a measurable subset $D_0 \subset H^+(x)$ with $\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^+(x)}(D_0) > 0$ such that for each $y \in D_0$, $(\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^+(ym_\theta)})^U_{ym_\theta}$ is the dirac measure at ym_θ for a positive measurable subset of m_θ's. For $s \geq 0$, denote by $\mathcal{H}^s$ the s-dimensional Hausdorff measure on $\Lambda(\Gamma) - \{x^-\}$; so $\mathcal{H}^\delta = \mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H^+(x)}$. In the identification of $H^+(x)$ with $\mathbb{R}^2$ via the map $y \mapsto y^+$, this implies that there is a subset $D_0' \subset \Lambda(\Gamma) - \{x^-\} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\mathcal{H}^\delta(D_0') > 0$ such that for all $\xi \in D_0'$, there is a positive measurable subset of lines L through ξ such that $0 < \mathcal{H}^0((\Lambda(\Gamma) - \{x^-\}) \cap L) < \infty$. This contradicts Theorem 6.2 which implies that $(\Lambda(\Gamma) - \{x^-\}) \cap L$ has dimension $\delta - 1 > 0$ for almost all lines through ξ. □

Corollary 6.10. *If $\delta > 1$, the* BMS *measure m^{BMS} is U-recurrent, i.e., for any measurable subset B of X, $\{t : xu_t \in B\}$ is unbounded for a.e. $x \in B$.*

Proof. By [8, Theorem 7.6], Theorem 6.9 implies that $(m^{\mathrm{BMS}})^U_x$ is infinite for almost all x. [8, Theorem 6.25] implies the claim. □

6.5. Doubling for the $(\mu^{\mathrm{BMS}})^U_x$.

As before, we assume $m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\Omega) = 1$. Since Ω is a compact subset, we have

$$\rho := \tfrac{1}{2} \inf\{\rho_x : x \in \Omega\} > 0. \tag{13}$$

Fix $\epsilon > 0$. It follows from Theorem 6.9 that there exist $0 < \beta = \beta(\epsilon) \ll \rho$ and a compact subset $\Omega'_\epsilon \subset \Omega$ with $m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\Omega'_\epsilon) > 1 - \frac{\epsilon^2}{2}$ such that

$$(m^{\mathrm{BMS}})^U_x[-3\beta, 3\beta] < \tfrac{1}{2}(m^{\mathrm{BMS}})^U_x[-(\rho - \beta), \rho - \beta] \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega'_\epsilon. \tag{14}$$

Since the covering $\{xB_\tau : x \in \Omega, \tau > 0\}$ admits a disjoint subcovering of Ω with full BMS measure (see [21, Theorem 2.8]), there exist $x_0 \in \Omega_\epsilon$ and $0 < \tau < \beta(\epsilon)$ such that for $B_{x_0}(\tau) := x_0 N^-_\tau A_\tau M N_\tau$,

$$m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(B_{x_0}(\tau) \cap \Omega'_\epsilon) > (1 - \tfrac{\epsilon^2}{2}) \cdot m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(B_{x_0}(\tau)). \tag{15}$$

Recall the notation $T_\rho = N^-_\rho A_\rho M$, and set $\nu = \nu_{x_0 T_\rho}$ for simplicity. Using Theorem 6.9, we will prove:

Theorem 6.11. *Let $\delta > 1$. Let $c_0 > 1$ be as in Theorem 4.1 where F_0 is the 2ρ-neighborhood of Ω. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be small and let $0 < \tau < \rho$. Let $B_{x_0}(\tau)$ be as above. There exists a Borel subset $\Xi^{\mathrm{PS}}_\epsilon(x_0) \subset x_0 T_\tau$ which satisfies the following properties.*

- (i) $\nu(\Xi^{\mathrm{PS}}_\epsilon(x_0)) \geq (1 - c_0^4 \cdot \epsilon)\nu(x_0 T_\tau)$*;*
- (ii) *for any $xm_\theta \in \Xi^{\mathrm{PS}}_\epsilon(x_0)$, with θ a PL direction for (x, τ), there exists a Borel subset $O_\theta(x)$, contained in $\{t \in xV_\theta : D(\sigma^\tau_{x,\theta})(t) > 0\}$, and*

$$\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_x(O_\theta(x) U^\rho_\theta) \geq 2\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_x(O_\theta(x) U^{2\tau}_\theta) \geq \tfrac{\tau^\delta}{4c_0}.$$

Despite the rather complicated formulation of this theorem, which is tailored towards our application later, the theorem is intuitively clear. Indeed $B_{x_0}(\tau)$ is chosen so that for "most" BMS points we have (14). On the other hands in view of Corollary 5.5 for a PL direction θ we have $D(\sigma^\tau_{x,\theta})$ is positive $\sigma^\tau_{x,\theta}$-almost everywhere. Therefore, by Fubini's theorem for "most"

BMS points $x \in B_{x_0}(\tau)$ the "most" points on xN_ρ satisfy both (14) and the non-vanishing of the Radon-Nikodym derivative which implies the theorem. The precise treatment of the above sketch of the proof is given in the rest of this subsection.

Lemma 6.12. *Let $xm_\theta \in x_0T_\tau$. For any Borel subset $O'_\theta(x) \subset p_\theta(xN_\tau \cap \Omega'_\epsilon m_\theta^{-1})$,*

$$\mu_x^{\mathrm{PS}}(O'_\theta(x)U_\theta^\rho) \geq 2\mu_x^{\mathrm{PS}}(O'_\theta(x)U_\theta^{2\tau}).$$

Proof. If $t \in p_\theta(xN_\tau \cap \Omega'_\epsilon m_\theta^{-1})$ and hence $t = xv_\theta$ for $v_\theta \in V_\theta$ where $z_t m_\theta^{-1} = xv_\theta u_\theta$ for $z_t \in \Omega'_\epsilon$, we can write it as $tm_\theta = z_t m_\theta^{-1} u_\theta^{-1} m_\theta = z_t u_0$ for some $u_0 \in U^\tau$. Hence

$$|\mu_{tm_\theta}^{U^\rho}| \geq |\mu_{z_t}^{U^{\rho-\tau}}| \geq 2|\mu_{z_t}^{U^{3\tau}}| \geq 2|\mu_{tm_\theta}^{U^{2\tau}}|.$$

Using this and since $O'_\theta(x) \subset p_\theta(xN_\tau \cap \Omega'_\epsilon m_\theta^{-1})$, we have

$$\mu_x^{\mathrm{PS}}(O'_\theta(x)U_\theta^\rho) = \int_{O'_\theta(x)} |\mu_t^{U_\theta^\rho}| d\sigma_{x,\theta}^\rho(t) = \int_{O'_\theta(x)} |\mu_{tm_\theta}^{U^\rho}| d\sigma_{x,\theta}^\rho(t)$$
$$\geq 2\int_{O'_\theta(x)} |\mu_{tm_\theta}^{U^{2\tau}}| d\sigma_{x,\theta}^\rho(t) = 2\int_{O'_\theta(x)} |\mu_t^{U_\theta^{2\tau}}| d\sigma_{x,\theta}^\rho(t) = 2\mu_x^{\mathrm{PS}}(O'_\theta(x)U_\theta^{2\tau}).$$

□

Lemma 6.13. *For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a compact subset $\Omega_\epsilon \subset \Omega'_\epsilon$ with $m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\Omega_\epsilon) > 1 - \epsilon^2$ such that*

$$m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(B_{x_0}(\tau) \cap \Omega_\epsilon) > (1-\epsilon^2) \cdot m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(B_{x_0}(\tau))$$

and

$$p_\theta(xN_\tau \cap \Omega_\epsilon m_\theta^{-1}) \subset \{t \in xV_\theta : D(\sigma_{x,\theta}^\tau, t) > 0\}$$

for all $xm_\theta \in x_0T_\tau$ with θ a PL-direction for (x,τ).

Proof. Setting $xV'_\theta := \{t \in xV_\theta : D(\sigma_{x,\theta}^\tau, t) = 0\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\cup_{xm_\theta \in x_0T_\tau} xV'_\theta U_\theta^\tau) \\ &= \int_{xm_\theta \in x_0T_\tau} \mu_x^{\mathrm{PS}}(xV'_\theta U_\theta^\tau) d\nu(xm_\theta) \\ &= \int_{xm_\theta \in x_0T_\tau} \int_{t \in xV'_\theta} |(\mu_x^{\mathrm{PS}})_x^{U_\theta^\tau}| d\sigma_{x,\theta}^\tau(t) d\nu(xm_\theta) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence there exists an open subset $\mathcal{O}_\epsilon$ of $B_{x_0}(\tau)$ which contains the subset $\cup_{xm_\theta \in x_0T_\tau} xV'_\theta U_\theta^\tau$ and $m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\mathcal{O}_\epsilon) \leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \cdot m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(B_{x_0}(\tau))$. Now set $\Omega_\epsilon := \Omega'_\epsilon - \mathcal{O}_\epsilon$. It is easy to check that this Ω_ϵ satisfies the claim. □

For $\epsilon > 0$, we set

$$\Xi_\epsilon^{\mathrm{PS}}(x_0) := \{x \in x_0T_\tau : \mu_x^{\mathrm{PS}}(xN_\tau \cap \Omega_\epsilon) > (1-\epsilon)\mu_x^{\mathrm{PS}}(xN_\tau)\}.$$

Lemma 6.14. *For all small $0 < \epsilon < 1$,*

$$\nu(\Xi_\epsilon^{\mathrm{PS}}(x_0)) \geq (1 - c_0^4 \cdot \epsilon)\nu(x_0T_\tau).$$

Proof. Set $b_1 := \inf_{x\in x_0T_\tau} \frac{\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{x_0}(x_0N_\tau)}{\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_x(xN_\tau)}$ and $b_2 := \sup_{x\in x_0T_\tau} \frac{\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{x_0}(x_0N_\tau)}{\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_x(xN_\tau)}$. Since $x_0^+ \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$ and $x_0^+ = x^+$, we have $x^+ \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$ and hence it follows from Theorem 4.1 that $c_0^{-4} < \frac{b_2}{b_1} < c_0^4$.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}&m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(B_{x_0}(\tau)\cap\Omega_\epsilon)\\ &\le \int_{\Xi^{\mathrm{PS}}_\epsilon(x_0)} \mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_y(yN_\tau)d\nu(y) + (1-\epsilon)\int_{x_0T_\tau-\Xi^{\mathrm{PS}}_\epsilon(x_0)} \mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_y(yN_\tau)d\nu(y)\\ &\le m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(B_{x_0}(\tau)) - \tfrac{\epsilon}{b_2}\nu(x_0T_\tau - \Xi^{\mathrm{PS}}_\epsilon(x_0))\cdot\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{x_0}(x_0N_\tau).\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 6.13, it follows that

$$\epsilon^2\cdot m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(B_{x_0}(\tau)) \ge \tfrac{\epsilon}{b_2}\nu(x_0T_\tau - \Xi^{\mathrm{PS}}_\epsilon(x_0))\cdot\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{x_0}(x_0N_\tau)$$

and hence

$$\epsilon\cdot b_1^{-1}\nu(x_0T_\tau)\cdot\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{x_0}(x_0N_\tau) \ge \tfrac{1}{b_2}\nu(x_0T_\tau - \Xi^{\mathrm{PS}}_\epsilon(x_0))\cdot\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{x_0}(x_0N_\tau).$$

Therefore

$$\nu(x_0T_\tau - \Xi^{\mathrm{PS}}_\epsilon(x_0)) \le \epsilon\cdot\tfrac{b_2}{b_1}\nu(x_0T_\tau),$$

implying the claim. ☐

By the M-invariance of m^{BMS}, by Lemma 6.7,

$$\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{xm_\theta}(\Omega_\epsilon\cap xm_\theta N_\tau) = \mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{xm_\theta}(\Omega_\epsilon\cap xN_\tau m_\theta) = \mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_x(\Omega_\epsilon m_\theta^{-1}\cap xN_\tau).$$

Note that for any $xm_\theta \in \Xi^{\mathrm{PS}}_\epsilon(x_0)$, We have

$$\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_x(xN_\tau\cap\Omega_\epsilon m_\theta^{-1}) > (1-\epsilon)\mu_x(xN_\tau) \ge \tfrac{\tau^\delta}{2c_0}.$$

By setting $O_\theta(x) := p_\theta(xN_\rho\cap\Omega_\epsilon m_\theta^{-1})$, we note that $O_\theta(x)U_\theta^{2\tau}$ contains $xN_\tau\cap\Omega_\epsilon m_\theta^{-1}$ and hence for all small $0<\epsilon\ll 1$,

$$\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_x(O_\theta(x)U_\theta^{2\tau}) \ge (1-\epsilon)\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_x(xN_\tau\cap\Omega_\epsilon m_\theta^{-1}) \ge \tfrac{\tau^\delta}{2c_0}.$$

Therefore the above three lemmas prove Theorem 6.11.

7. Window theorem for Hopf average

We will combine the results from previous sections and prove the window theorem 7.7 in this section. We first show that the disintegration along U of λ_s, notation as in Section 3, has certain doubling properties, see Theorem 7.1. This is done by applying results in Section 5, in particular the key lemma, to $\lambda_{E,x,s}$ and the limiting measure μ^{PS}_x, in combination with Theorem 6.11, which gives a rather strong doubling property for the disintegration of the PS measure. As we mentioned in the introduction, in general, the weak* convergence of measures does not give control on the corresponding conditional measures, e.g., one should recall the well-known discontinuity of the entropy. However, here the key lemma gives a good control both on the prelimiting measures $\lambda_{E,x,s}$ and the limit measure μ^{PS}_x, and helps us to draw some connection between the conditionals.

In order to get Window Theorem 7.3, we flow by a_{-s}, for a suitable s, and bring $[-T,T]$ to size $[-\rho,\rho]$. We now are working with $m^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,s}$ rather than $\frac{1}{m^{\mathrm{BR}}(E)}m^{\mathrm{BR}}|_E$, and the desired estimate follows from Theorem 7.1

7.1. **Window theorem for χ_E.** Let Γ be a convex cocompact subgroup with $\delta > 1$. Let E be a BMS box. For simplicity, we set $\mu_s := \mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,s}$ and $\lambda_{x,s} = \lambda_{E,x,s}$ defined in section 5. For $0 < r \leq 1$ and $\rho > 0$ as in (13), we put

$$E_s(r) := \{x \in Ea_{-s} : \frac{(\mu_s)^U_x[-2\rho r, 2\rho r]}{(\mu_s)^U_x[-2\rho, 2\rho]} > 1 - r\}.$$

Theorem 7.1. *There exist* $0 < r_0 < 1$ *and* $s_0 > 1$, *depending on* E, *such that for all* $s > s_0$ *we have*

$$\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,s}(E_s(r_0)) < 1 - r_0.$$

Proof. Suppose not; then there is a subsequence $r_i \to 0$ and a subsequence $s_i \to \infty$ such that $\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,s_i}(E_{s_i}(r_i)) \geq 1 - r_i$. Set $\mu_i = \mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,s_i}$ and $E_i := E_{s_i}(r_i)$.

Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Let $x_0 \in \Omega$, $0 < \tau < \rho$, $c_0 > 1$ and $\Xi^{\mathrm{PS}}_\epsilon(x_0)$ be as in Theorem 6.11. Set $q_0 := m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(B_{x_0}(\tau)) > 0$ and

$$x_0T_i := \{y \in x_0T_\tau : \lambda_{s_i,y}(E_i \cap yN_\tau) > \left(1 - \sqrt{\tfrac{2r_i}{q_0}}\right)\lambda_{s_i,y}(yN_\tau)\}.$$

Recall the measure ν from Theorem 6.11. We claim that for all large $i \gg 1$, we have

$$\nu(x_0T_i) \geq (1 - 4\sqrt{r_i})\nu(T_\tau). \tag{16}$$

We first show that $\mu_i(E_i \cap B_{x_0}(\tau)) \geq (1 - \frac{2r_i}{q_0})\mu_i(B_{x_0}(\tau))$ for all large i. If this does not hold, by passing to a subsequence, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - r_i < \mu_i(E_i) &= \mu_i(E_i \cap B_{x_0}(\tau)) + \mu_i(E_i - B_{x_0}(\tau)) \\ &\leq |\mu_i| - \tfrac{2r_i}{q_0}\mu_i(B_{x_0}(\tau)). \end{aligned}$$

Since $|\mu_i| = 1$, it follows that $\frac{2}{q_0}\mu_i(B_{x_0}(\tau)) \leq 1$. Since μ_i weakly converges to m^{BMS} by Theorem 3.1, $\frac{\mu_i(B_{x_0}(\tau))}{q_0} \to 1$, which gives a contradiction. Now, by the same type of argument as the proof of Lemma 6.14, this implies (16).

Passing to a subsequence, which we continue to denote by r_i, we assume that $4\sum_i \sqrt{r}_i < \epsilon/2$ and $2r_i/q_0 < \epsilon$ for all i. It follows that that if we set

$$\Xi^*(x_0) := \cap_i x_0T_i,$$

then $\nu(\Xi^*(x_0)) > (1 - \epsilon)\nu(x_0T_\tau)$.

Hence for all sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\nu(\Xi^{\mathrm{PS}}_\epsilon(x_0) \cap \Xi^*(x_0)) > (1 - (1 + c_0^4)\epsilon)\,\nu(x_0T_\tau) > 0.$$

Since $\mathrm{supp}(\nu) \subset \{g \in X : g^- \in \Lambda(\Gamma)\}$, for all small $\epsilon > 0$, we can find $xm_\theta \in \Xi^*(x_0) \cap \Xi^{\mathrm{PS}}_\epsilon(x_0)$ (depending on $\epsilon > 0$) with $(xm_\theta)^- = x^- \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$ with $\theta \in \Theta(x)$ where $\Theta(x)$ is given as in Corollary 5.10 for $\{\rho, \tau\}$ applied to measures constructed as in that Corollary from μ_i. Since $x^+ = x_0^+$, we have $x^\pm \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$.

Let $\{s_{i_j}\}$ be the corresponding subsequence given by Corollary 5.10 depending on (x, θ). By passing to that subsequence, we set $s_i := s_{i_j}$. By the M-invariance of the measure μ_{s_i} and as $xm_\theta \in x_0 T_i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{x,s_i}(E_i m_\theta^{-1} \cap xN_\tau) &= \lambda_{xm_\theta,s_i}(E_i \cap xm_\theta N_\tau) \\ &\geq (1 - \sqrt{\tfrac{2r_i}{q_0}})\lambda_{xm_\theta,s_i}(xm_\theta N_\tau). \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

For $O_\theta(x)$ as in Theorem 6.11, we consider $L_i := p_\theta(O_\theta(x)U_\theta^\tau \cap E_i m_\theta^{-1})$. By Lemma 7.2 below,

$$\lambda_{x,s_i}(L_i U_\theta^\rho) \leq \tfrac{1}{1-r_i}\lambda_{x,s_i}(L_i U_\theta^{2\tau}).$$

By (17), E_i plays the role of W_i in the key Lemma 5.11. Since $L_i = p_\theta(E_i m_\theta^{-1}) \cap O_\theta(x)$ and $\{t \in O_\theta(x) : D(\sigma_{x,\theta}^\tau, t) = 0\} = \emptyset$, we obtain that for all large $i \gg 1$,

$$\lambda_{x,s_i}(O_\theta(x)U_\theta^\rho) = \sigma_{x,\theta,s_i}^\rho(O_\theta(x)) \leq (1+\epsilon)\sigma_{x,\theta,s_i}^\rho(L_i) = (1+\epsilon)\lambda_{x,s_i}(xL_i U_\theta^\rho). \tag{18}$$

Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{x,s_i}(O_\theta(x)U_\theta^\rho) &\leq \tfrac{(1+\epsilon)}{(1-r_i)}\lambda_{x,s_i}(O_\theta(x)U_\theta^{2\tau}) \\ &\leq (1+2\epsilon)\lambda_{x,s_i}(O_\theta(x)U_\theta^{2\tau}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $x^\pm \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$, we have λ_{x,s_i} weakly converges to μ_x^{PS} by Theorem 3.3. Hence by sending $s_i \to \infty$, it follows that

$$\mu_x^{\mathrm{PS}}(O_\theta(x)U_\theta^\rho) \leq (1+2\epsilon)\mu_x^{\mathrm{PS}}(O_\theta(x)U_\theta^{2\tau}).$$

Together with Theorem 6.11, this implies that

$$\epsilon \cdot \mu_x^{\mathrm{PS}}(O_\theta(x)U_\theta^{2\tau}) \geq \mu_x^{\mathrm{PS}}(O_\theta(x)U_\theta^{2\tau}) \geq \tfrac{\tau^\delta}{2c_0} > 0,$$

which is a contradiction. This finishes a proof of Theorem 7.1. □

Lemma 7.2. *Let* $xm_\theta \in x_0 T_\tau$ *for* $x_0 \in \Omega$ *and* $s > 0$. *For any Borel subset* $L_\theta(x) \subset p_\theta(xN_\tau \cap E_s(r)m_\theta^{-1})$ *and for all sufficiently small* $0 < r \ll 1$,

$$\lambda_{x,s}(L_\theta(x)U_\theta^\rho) \leq \tfrac{1}{1-r}\lambda_{x,s}(L_\theta(x)U_\theta^{2\tau}). \tag{19}$$

Proof. Set $\tilde{L} = p_\theta(xN_\tau \cap E_s(r)m_\theta^{-1})$. Note that if $t \in \tilde{L}$ and hence $t \in p_\theta(E_s(r)m_\theta^{-1})$, then $tm_\theta = z_t u_0$ for some $z_t \in E_s(r)$ and $u_0 \in U^\tau$. On the other hand, it follows from the definition of $E_s(r)$ that

$$|(\mu_s)_{z_t}^{U^{2\rho}}| \leq \tfrac{1}{1-r}|(\mu_s)_{z_t}^{U^{2r\rho}}|$$

and hence

$$|(\mu_s)_{tm_\theta}^{U^\rho}| \leq |(\mu_s)_{z_t}^{U^{\rho+\tau}}| \leq |(\mu_s)_{z_t}^{U^{2\rho}}| \leq \tfrac{1}{1-r}|(\mu_s)_{z_t}^{U^{2r\rho}}| \leq \tfrac{1}{1-r}|(\mu_s)_{tm_\theta}^{U^{2r\rho+\tau}}|.$$

Therefore, since $\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,s}$ is M-invariant, by Lemma 6.7,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lambda_{x,s}(xL_\theta(x)U^\rho_\theta) = \int_{t\in L_\theta(x)} |(\mu_s)^{U^\rho_\theta}_t|\, d\sigma^\rho_{s,x,\theta}(t) = \int_{t\in L_\theta(x)} |(\mu_s)^{U^\rho}_{tm_\theta}|\, d\sigma^\rho_{x,\theta,s}(t)\\
&\le \tfrac{1}{1-r}\int_{t\in L_\theta(x)} |(\mu_s)^{U^{2\tau}}_{tm_\theta}|\, d\sigma^\rho_{x,\theta,s}(t) = \tfrac{1}{1-r}\int_{t\in L_\theta(x)} |(\mu_s)^{U^{2\tau}_\theta}_t|\, d\sigma^\rho_{x,\theta,s}(t)\\
&= \tfrac{1}{1-r}\lambda_{x,s}(L_\theta(x)U^{2\tau}_\theta).
\end{aligned}$$

□

We deduce the following from Theorem 7.3:

Theorem 7.3. *Let E be as above. There exist $0 < r < 1$ and $T_0 > 1$, depending on E, such that for all $T > T_0$*

$$m^{\mathrm{BR}}\{x \in E : \int_{-rT}^{rT} \chi_E(xu_t)dt < (1-r)\cdot \int_{-T}^{T} \chi_E(xu_t)dt\} \ge r \cdot m^{\mathrm{BR}}(E).$$

Proof. Setting

$$E(s,r) := \{x \in E : \frac{\int_{-2r\rho e^s}^{2r\rho e^s} \chi_E(xu_t)dt}{\int_{-2\rho e^s}^{2\rho e^s} \chi_E(xu_t)dt} \ge 1-r\},$$

it suffices to prove that for some $0 < r < 1$ and for all s large.

$$m^{\mathrm{BR}}(E(s,r)) < (1-r)m^{\mathrm{BR}}(E). \tag{20}$$

We note that

$$E(s,r) = \{x \in E : \frac{(\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{0,E})^U_x[-2r\rho e^s, 2r\rho e^s]}{(\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{0,E})^U_x[-2\rho e^s, 2\rho e^s]} \ge 1-r\},$$

where $(\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,0})^U_x$ denotes the leafwise measure of $\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,0} = \frac{m^{\mathrm{BR}}|_E}{m^{\mathrm{BR}}(E)}$.

Note that (20) follows from Theorem 7.1 if we show

$$m^{\mathrm{BR}}(E(s,r)) = m^{\mathrm{BR}}(E)\cdot \mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,s}(E_s(r)) \text{ for all } 0 < r < 1.$$

We now show the above identity. Let s be fixed then for BR almost all points x we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{(\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,0})^U_x[-2r\rho e^s, 2r\rho e^s]}{(\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,0})^U_x[-2\rho e^s, 2\rho e^s]} &= \frac{\int_{-2r\rho}^{2r\rho} \chi_E(xa_{-s}u_ta_s)dt}{\int_{-2\rho}^{2\rho} \chi_E(xa_{-s}u_ta_s)dt} && \text{since } m^{\mathrm{BR}} \text{ is } U\text{-invariant}\\
&= \frac{\int_{-2r\rho}^{2r\rho} \chi_{Ea_{-s}}(yu_t)dt}{\int_{-2\rho}^{2\rho} \chi_{Ea_{-s}}(yu_t)dt} && y = xa_{-s}\\
&= \frac{(\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{Ea_{-s},0})^U_y[-2r\rho, 2r\rho]}{(\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{Ea_{-s},0})^U_y[-2\rho, 2\rho]} && \text{since } m^{\mathrm{BR}} \text{ is } U\text{-invariant}\\
&= \frac{(e^{(\delta-2)s}\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,s})^U_y[-2r\rho, 2r\rho]}{(e^{(\delta-2)s}\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,s})^U_y[-2\rho, 2\rho]} && \text{by the definition of } m^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,s}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $a_{-s}E(s,r)$ coincides with $E_s(r)$, up to a BR null set. This implies the claim using the definition of $\mu^{\mathrm{BR}}_{E,s}$. □

7.2. **Ergodic decomposition and the Hopf ratio theorem.** In this subsection, let μ be a locally finite U-invariant conservative measure on X. Let $\mathcal{M}_\infty(X)$ denote the space of locally finite measures on X with weak* topology.

Let $\mathcal{A}$ denote a countably generated σ-algebra equivalent to the σ-algebra of all U-invariant subsets of X. There exist a $\mathcal{A}$-measurable conull set X' of X, a family $\{\mu_x = \mu_x^{\mathcal{A}} : x \in X'\}$ of conditional measures on X and a probability measure μ_* on X which give rise to the ergodic decomposition of μ:

$$\mu = \int \mu_x \, d\mu_*(x)$$

where the map $X' \to \mathcal{M}_\infty(X)$, $x \mapsto \mu_x$, is Borel measurable, μ_x is a U-invariant, ergodic and conservative measure on X and for any $\psi \in L^1(X, \mu)$,

$$\mu(\psi) = \int_{x \in X} \mu_x(\psi) \, d\mu_*(x).$$

see [8, 5.1.4].

The following is the Hopf ratio theorem in a form convenient for us ([12], see also [37]).

Theorem 7.4. *Let $\psi, \phi \in L^1(m^{\mathrm{BR}})$ with $\phi \geq 0$. Furthermore suppose ψ and ϕ are compactly supported. Then*

$$\lim_T \frac{\int_0^T \psi(xu_t)dt}{\int_0^T \phi(xu_t)dt} = \lim_T \frac{\int_{-T}^0 \psi(xu_t)dt}{\int_{-T}^0 \phi(xu_t)dt} = \frac{\mu_x(\psi)}{\mu_x(\phi)}$$

for μ-almost all $x \in \{x \in X : \sup_T \int_0^T \phi(xu_t)dt > 0\}$ [3].

Lemma 7.5. *Fix a compact subset $E \subset X$ with $\mu(E) > 0$. Let ϕ be a non-negative compactly supported Borel function on X such that $\phi|_E > 0$. For any $\rho > 0$ there exists a compact subset $E_\rho(\phi) \subset E$ with $\mu(E - E_\rho(\phi)) < \rho \cdot \mu(E)$ satisfying:*

1. *the map $x \mapsto \mu_x$ is continuous for all $x \in E_\rho(\phi)$;*
2. $\inf_{x \in E_\rho} \mu_x(\phi) > 0$*;*
3. *for any $\psi \in C_c(X)$ the convergence*

   $$\frac{\int_0^T \psi(xu_t)dt}{\int_0^T \phi(xu_t)dt} \to \frac{\mu_x(\psi)}{\mu_x(\phi)}$$

   is uniform on $E_\rho(\phi)$.

Proof. By Lusin's theorem there exists a compact subset $E' \subset E$ with $\mu(E - E') < \frac{\rho}{3}\mu(E)$ and the map $x \mapsto \mu_x$ is continuous on E'. Since $\int_0^T \phi(xu_t)dt \to +\infty$ for almost all $x \in E$ by the conservativity of μ, we have $\mu_x(\phi) > 0$ almost all $x \in E$. Since $x \mapsto \mu_x(\phi)$ is a measurable map, it follows again by

---

[3] note that for almost all x in this set $\mu_x(\phi) > 0$, see [37, Page 3].

Lusin's theorem that there exists a compact subset $E'' \subset E'$ with $\mu(E' - E'') < \frac{\rho}{3}\mu(E')$, $\int_0^\infty \phi(xu_t)dt = \infty$ for all $x \in E''$, and $\inf_{x \in E''} \mu_x(\phi) > 0$.

We claim that for any $\epsilon > 0$ and any compact subset Q of X, there exists a compact subset $E_0 = E_0(Q, \epsilon) \subset E''$ such that $\mu(E'' - E_0) < \epsilon\mu(E'')$ and for all $\psi \in C(Q)$, the convergence

$$\frac{\int_0^T \psi(xu_t)dt}{\int_0^T \phi(xu_t)dt} \to \frac{\mu_x(\psi)}{\mu_x(\phi)}$$

is uniform on E_0. Let $\mathcal{B} = \{\psi_j\}$ be a countable dense subset of $C(Q)$ which includes the constant function χ_Q. We can deduce from the Hopf ratio Theorem 7.4 and Egorov's theorem that there is a compact subset $E_1 \subset E''$ such that $\mu(E'' - E_1) < \frac{\epsilon}{3}\mu(E'')$, $\sup_{x \in E_1} \mu_x(Q) < \infty$, and for each $\psi_j \in \mathcal{B}$, the convergence

$$\frac{\int_0^T \psi_j(xu_t)dt}{\int_0^T \phi(xu_t)dt} \to \frac{\mu_x(\psi_j)}{\mu_x(\phi)} \tag{21}$$

is uniform on E_1. We will show that we have the uniform convergence in E_1 for all $\psi \in C(Q)$. Set $a_0 := \sup_{x \in E_1} \frac{\mu_x(Q)}{\mu_x(\phi)} < \infty$. For any $\eta > 0$, there exists $\psi_j \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $\|\psi_j - \psi\|_\infty < \eta$. Let $T_0 \gg 1$ be such that

$$\left| \frac{\int_0^T \psi_j(xu_t)dt}{\int_0^T \phi(xu_t)dt} - \frac{\mu_x(\psi_j)}{\mu_x(\phi)} \right| \le \eta, \quad \left| \frac{\int_0^T \chi_Q(xu_t)dt}{\int_0^T \phi(xu_t)dt} - \frac{\mu_x(\chi_Q)}{\mu_x(\phi)} \right| \le \eta$$

for all $x \in E_1$ and $T \ge T_0$. Now for any $x \in E_1$ and $T \ge T_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \frac{\int_0^T \psi(xu_t)dt}{\int_0^T \phi(xu_t)dt} - \frac{\mu_x(\psi)}{\mu_x(\phi)} \right| \\
&\le \frac{\int_0^T |\psi(xu_t) - \psi_{j_0}(xu_t)|dt}{\int_0^T \phi(xu_t)dt} + \left| \frac{\int_0^T \psi_{j_0}(xu_t)dt}{\int_0^T \phi(xu_t)dt} - \frac{\mu_x(\psi_{j_0})}{\mu_x(\phi)} \right| + \left| \frac{\mu_x(\psi_{j_0})}{\mu_x(\phi)} - \frac{\mu_x(\psi)}{\mu_x(\phi)} \right| \\
&\le \frac{\int_0^T \chi_Q(xu_t)dt}{\int_0^T \phi(xu_t)dt} \|\psi - \psi_j\|_\infty + \eta + \frac{\mu_x(Q)}{\mu_x(\phi)} \|\psi - \psi_j\|_\infty \\
&\le \frac{\mu_x(Q)}{\mu_x(\phi)}\eta + \eta^2 + \eta + \frac{\mu_x(Q)}{\mu_x(\phi)}\eta \\
&\le \eta(2a_0 + \eta + 1).
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim. Let $Q_1 \subset Q_2 \subset \cdots$ be an exhaustion of X by compact sets. Then $E_\rho(\phi) := \cap_i E_0(Q_i, \frac{\rho}{4^{i+1}})$ satisfies all the desired properties. □

7.3. **Window theorem for $\psi \in C_c(X)$ with $\psi|_E > 0$.** Let Γ be a convex cocompact subgroup with $\delta > 1$. Let $\mathcal{A}$ denote a countably generated σ-algebra which is equivalent to the σ-algebra of all U-invariant subsets of X, as before.

Since m^{BR} is U-conservative by Theorem 6.6, we may write an ergodic decomposition

$$m^{\mathrm{BR}} = \int_{x\in X'} \mu_x \, dm_*^{\mathrm{BR}}(x)$$

where X' is a $\mathcal{A}$-measurable conull set of X, m_*^{BR} is a probability measure on X, and for all $x \in X'$, $\mu_x = \mu_x^{\mathcal{A}}$ is a U-invariant ergodic conservative measure.

Lemma 7.6. *Let E and $0 < r < 1$ be as in Theorem 7.3. Let $\psi \in C_c(X)$ with $\psi|_E > 0$. For any $\rho > 0$, there exists $s_0 \geq 1$ such that for all $s > s_0$,*

$$m^{\mathrm{BR}}\{x \in E : \int_{-rs}^{rs} \psi(xu_t)dt \leq (1-r+\rho)\int_{-s}^{s}\psi(xu_t)dt\} \geq (r-2\rho)\cdot m^{\mathrm{BR}}(E).$$

Proof. For simplicity, set $F_\rho(s) := \{x \in E : \int_{-rs}^{rs}\psi(xu_t)dt \leq (1-r+\rho)\int_{-s}^{s}\psi(xu_t)dt\}$. Let $E_\rho(\chi_E) \subset E$ be as in Lemma 7.5. Since $\psi|_E > 0$, there is a subset E'_ρ of $E_\rho(\chi_E)$ such that $m^{\mathrm{BR}}(E - E'_\rho) < 2\rho \cdot m^{\mathrm{BR}}(E)$ and $\inf_{x\in E'_\rho} \frac{\mu_x(\psi)}{\mu_x(E)} > 0$. Then for all large s (uniformly for all $x \in E_\rho(\chi_E)$),

$$\int_{-s}^{s}\psi(xu_t)dt = \left(\tfrac{\mu_x(\psi)}{\mu_x(E)} + a_x(\psi, s)\right)\int_{-s}^{s}\chi_E(xu_t)dt$$

where $|a_x(\psi, s)| \leq a(s) \to 0$ as $s \to \infty$ by Lemma 7.5.

Setting $\tilde{E}(s,r) = \{x \in E : \int_{-rs}^{rs}\chi_E(xu_t)dt \geq (1-r)\cdot\int_{-s}^{s}\chi_E(xu_t)dt\}$, we claim that $E'_\rho \cap (E - \tilde{E}(s,r)) \subset F_\rho(s)$ for all large s, from which the lemma follows by Theorem 7.3. For any $x \in E'_\rho \cap (E - \tilde{E}(s,r))$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{-rs}^{rs}\psi(xu_t)dt = (\tfrac{\mu_x(\psi)}{\mu_x(E)} + a_x(\psi, rs))\int_{-rs}^{rs}\chi_E(xu_t)dt \\
&\leq (\tfrac{\mu_x(\psi)}{\mu_x(E)} + |a_x(\psi, rs)|)(1-r)\int_{-s}^{s}\chi_E(xu_t)dt \\
&\leq (1-r)\int_{-s}^{s}\psi(xu_t)dt + (|a_x(\psi,s)| + |a_x(\psi,rs)|)(1-r)\int_{-s}^{s}\chi_E(xu_t).
\end{aligned}$$

Let $s_1 > 1$ be such that for $s \geq s_1$ and for all $x \in E'_\rho$,

$$\frac{(|a_x(\psi,s)| + |a_x(\psi,rs)|)(1-r)}{|\frac{\mu_x(\psi)}{\mu_x(E)} + a_x(\psi,s)|} \leq \rho;$$

this is possible since $\frac{\mu_x(\psi)}{\mu_x(E)}$ is uniformly bounded from below by a positive number. Then the claim holds. ☐

By taking $\rho = r/4$ and replacing $3r/4$ by r in the above lemma, we now obtain:

Theorem 7.7 (Window Theorem)**.** *Let $\psi \in C_c(X)$ be a non-negative function such that $\psi|_E > 0$. Then there exist $0 < r < 1$ and $T_0 > 1$ such that for any $T \geq T_0$,*

$$m^{\mathrm{BR}}\{x \in E : \int_{-rT}^{rT} \psi(xu_t)dt < (1-r)\int_{-T}^{T} \psi(xu_t)dt\} > \tfrac{r}{2} \cdot m^{\mathrm{BR}}(E).$$

It is worth mentioning that r obtained here maybe rather small. The following lemma demonstrates how the window estimates for a sequence will be used.

Lemma 7.8. *Let $\epsilon > 0$ and a sequence $s_k \to +\infty$ be given. Let E and ψ be as in Theorem 1.3. Fix $\rho > 0$. Let $x_k \in E_\rho(\psi)$ be a sequence satisfying*

$$\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t)dt \geq c\,\epsilon \int_0^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t)dt$$

for some $c > 0$ independent of k. Then for any $f \in C_c(X)$, as $k \to \infty$,

$$\frac{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} f(x_k u_t)dt}{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t)dt} \sim \frac{\mu_{x_k}(f)}{\mu_{x_k}(\psi)}.$$

Proof. By the Hopf ratio theorem, and Lemma 7.5, we have

$$\int_0^s f(x_k u_t)dt = \tfrac{\mu_{x_k}(f)}{\mu_{x_k}(\psi)} \int_0^s \psi(x_k u_t)dt + a_{x_k}(s)\int_0^s \psi(x_k u_t)dt$$

with $\lim_{s\to\infty} a_{x_k}(s) = 0$, uniformly in $\{x_k\}$. Therefore

$$\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} f(x_k u_t)dt = \tfrac{\mu_{x_k}(f)}{\mu_{x_k}(\psi)} \int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t)dt$$
$$+ a_{x_k}(s_k)\int_0^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t)dt - a_{x_k}((1-\epsilon)s_k)\int_0^{(1-\epsilon)s_k} \psi(x_k u_t)dt.$$

Since

$$|a_{x_k}(s_k)\int_0^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t)dt - a_{x_k}((1-\epsilon)s_k)\int_0^{(1-\epsilon)s_k} \psi(x_k u_t)dt|$$
$$\leq |a_{x_k}(s_k) + a_{x_k}((1-\epsilon)s_k)| \cdot \int_0^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t)dt \leq \tfrac{|a_{x_k}(s_k)+a_{x_k}((1-\epsilon)s_k)| \int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t)dt}{c\epsilon},$$

we obtain that

$$\frac{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} f(x_k u_t)dt}{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t)dt} = \frac{\mu_{x_k}(f)}{\mu_{x_k}(\psi)} + O(\tfrac{|a_{x_k}(s_k)+a_{x_k}((1-\epsilon)s_k)|}{c\epsilon}).$$

Since $a_{x_k}(s_k) + a_{x_k}((1-\epsilon)s_k) \to 0$, uniformly in $\{x_k\}$, the lemma follows. □

8. ADDITIONAL INVARIANCE AND ERGODICITY OF BR FOR $\delta > 1$

Let Γ be a convex cocompact subgroup with $\delta > 1$.

8.1. **Reduction.** Let $\mathcal{A}, X'$ and $m^{\mathrm{BR}} = \int_{x \in X} \mu_x dm_*^{\mathrm{BR}}(x)$ be as in the subsection 7.3.

Our strategy in proving the U-ergodicity of m^{BR} is to show that for almost all $x \in X$, μ_x is N-invariant.

Fix a BMS box E and a non-negative function $\psi \in C_c(X)$ with $\psi|_E > 0$. Let $0 < r < 1$ be as in the window theorem 7.7 and $r_0 := \frac{r}{16}$. Recall $E_{r_0}(\psi) \subset E$ from Lemma 7.5.

The next subsection is devoted to a proof of the following:

Theorem 8.1. *For any $x_0 \in E_{r_0}(\psi) \cap \operatorname{supp}(m^{\mathrm{BR}})$, μ_{x_0} is N-invariant.*

Corollary 8.2. *m^{BR} is U-ergodic.*

Proof. It follows from Lemma 8.3 below that

$$F := \{x \in X : \mu_x \text{ is } N\text{-invariant}\}$$

is N-invariant. We have $m^{\mathrm{BR}}(F) > 0$ by Theorem 8.1. As m^{BR} is N-ergodic by Theorem 2.8, it follows that $x \mapsto \mu_x$ is constant almost everywhere, and hence m^{BR} is U-ergodic. □

Lemma 8.3. *If $x, xn \in X'$ for $n \in N$, then $\mu_{xn} = n.\mu_x$. In particular, either $n.\mu_x = \mu_x$ or $n.\mu_x \perp \mu_x$.*

Proof. Since N is abelian and $U < N$, $\mathcal{A}_n := \{Cn : C \in \mathcal{A}\}$ coincides with $\mathcal{A}$ and $[x]_{\mathcal{A}_n} = [x]_{\mathcal{A}}\, n = [xn]_{\mathcal{A}}$. It follows that $\mu_x^{\mathcal{A}_n} = \mu_{xn}^{\mathcal{A}} = n.\mu_x^{\mathcal{A}}$. □

8.2. **Proof of Theorem 8.1.** As we explained in the introduction, we will flow two nearby points in the generic set and study their divergence in the "intermediate range". We first need to prove a refinement of the window theorem, see Propositions 8.5 and 8.6 below.

Fix $x_0 \in E_{r_0}(\psi) \cap \operatorname{supp}(m^{\mathrm{BR}})$.

Proposition 8.4. *There is a Borel subset $E' \subset E$ such that $m^{\mathrm{BR}}(E - E') = 0$ and for any $x \in E'$ and all integers $m \geq 1$,*

$$xN \cap B(x_0, \tfrac{1}{m}) \cap E_\rho(\psi) \neq \emptyset.$$

Proof. Set $N_k := \{n_z : \|z\| < k\}$. Since m^{BR} is N-ergodic, by [11], there exists a full measure subset E'_m of E such that for all $x \in E'_m$

$$\lim_k \frac{\int_{N_k} \chi_{B(x_0,1/m)\cap E_{r_0}(\psi)}(xn_z)dz}{\int_{N_k} \psi(xn_z)dz} = \frac{m^{\mathrm{BR}}(B(x_0,1/m) \cap E_{r_0}(\psi))}{m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\psi)}.$$

It suffices to take $E' := \cap_m E'_m$. □

Since $\inf_{x \in E_{r_0}(\psi)} \mu_x(\psi) > 0$ and $x \mapsto \frac{1}{\mu_x(\psi)}\mu_x$ is continuous on $E_{r_0}(\psi)$, there exists a symmetric neighborhood $\mathcal{O}$ such that

$$0 < \inf_{g \in \mathcal{O}, x \in E_{r_0}(\psi)} \frac{|\mu_x(g\psi)|}{\mu_x(\psi)} \leq \sup_{g \in \mathcal{O}, x \in E_{r_0}(\psi)} \frac{|\mu_x(g\psi)|}{\mu_x(\psi)} < \infty. \tag{22}$$

Set $K_\psi := \operatorname{supp}(\psi)\mathcal{O}$ and $K'_\psi := \cap_{g\in\mathcal{O}}\operatorname{supp}(\psi)g$. By Theorem 7.7, for all $s \ge T_0$, the following set has BR measure at least $\frac{5r}{16}m^{\mathrm{BR}}(E)$:

$$E_s := \{x \in E_{r_0}(\psi) \cap E_{r_0}(\chi_{K_\psi}) \cap E_{r_0}(\chi_{K'_\psi}) : \\ \int_{-rs}^{rs} \psi(xu_t)dt < (1-r)\int_{-s}^{s} \psi(xu_t)dt\}.$$

Therefore for each $s \ge T_0$, there exists a compact subset $\mathcal{G}(s)$ of $E_s \cap E'$ with $m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\mathcal{G}(s)) > \frac{r}{8}m^{\mathrm{BR}}(E)$.

We may write $\mathcal{G}(s)$ as $\mathcal{G}(s)^+ \cup \mathcal{G}(s)^-$ where

$$\mathcal{G}(s)^+ = \{x \in \mathcal{G}(s) : \int_0^{rs} \psi(xu_t)dt \le \tfrac{1-r}{2}\int_0^{s} \psi(xu_t)dt\};$$

$$\mathcal{G}(s)^- = \{x \in \mathcal{G}(s) : \int_{-rs}^{0} \psi(xu_t)dt \le \tfrac{1-r}{2}\int_{-s}^{0} \psi(xu_t)dt\}.$$

Therefore there exists an infinite sequence $p_i \to +\infty$ such that $m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\mathcal{G}(p_i)^+) \ge \frac{r}{16}$ for all i or $m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\mathcal{G}(p_i)^-) \ge \frac{r}{16}$ for all i.

In the following, we assume the former case that $m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\mathcal{G}(p_i)^+) \ge \frac{r}{16}$ for all i. The argument is symmetric in the other case.

Proposition 8.5. *Fix $\ell > 1$ and $\epsilon > 0$. There exist an infinite sequence $s_k = s_k(\ell,\epsilon)$ and elements $x_k = x_k(\ell,\epsilon), y_k = y_k(\ell,\epsilon) \in \mathcal{G}(s_k)^+$ which satisfy the following:*

1. *$y_k = x_k n^-_{w_k}$ where $c_1^{-1}s_k^{-2}\ell^{-1} \le |w_k| \le c_1 s_k^{-2}\ell^{-1}$ and $|\Im(w_k)| \ge \frac{|\Re(w_k)|}{c_1}$ where $c_1 > 1$ is independent of ℓ, ϵ, k.*
2. *each x_k satisfies*
$$\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t)dt \ge \frac{r\epsilon}{4}\int_0^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t)dt.$$

Proof. If $x \in \mathcal{G}^+(s)$, then, as $r < 1$,

$$\int_{rs}^{s} \psi(xu_t) \ge r\int_0^{s} \psi(xu_t)dt.$$

By subdividing $[r,1]$ into $\lfloor \epsilon^{-1} \rfloor$ number of subintervals $I_i = (r+(j-1)\epsilon, r+j\epsilon)$'s of length ϵ, there exists an integer $1 \le j = j(x,s) \le \lfloor \epsilon^{-1} \rfloor$ such that

$$\int_{(r+(j-1)\epsilon)s}^{(r+j\epsilon)s} \psi(xu_t)dt \ge \frac{r\epsilon}{4}\int_0^{s} \psi(xu_t)dt.$$

Let $d_0 = d_0(r/16) > 0$ be as in Proposition 4.4. Applying Proposition 4.4 to each $\mathcal{G}(p_i)^+$ and a sequence $(p_i\ell)^2$, we can find $x_i, y_i \in \mathcal{G}(p_i)^+$ satisfying $y_i = x_i n^-_{w_i}$ with $d_0^{-1}p_i^{-2}\ell^{-1} \le |w_i| \le d_0 p_i^{-2}\ell^{-1}$ and $|\Im(w_i)| \ge \frac{|\Re w_i|}{d_0}$. Choose a subsequence x_{i_k} of $\{x_i\}$ such that $j(x_{i_k}, p_{i_k})$ is a constant, say, j_0. Setting $s_k := (r + j_0\epsilon)p_{i_k}$, $x_k := x_{i_k}$, $y_k = y_{i_k}$, we have

$$\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t)dt \ge \frac{r\epsilon}{4}\int_0^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t)dt$$

and $rp_{i_k} \leq s_k \leq (r+1)p_{i_k}$. Hence the claim follows with $c_1 = d_0(r+1)^2$. $\square$

We now use the fact that the two orbits $x_k u_t$ and $y_k u_t$ stay "close" to each other for all $t \in [0, s_k]$, to show that y_k's in Proposition 8.5 also satisfy the same type of window estimate. Let us fix some notation; writing $y_k u_t = x_k u_t (u_{-t} n^-_{w_k} u_t)$, we set

$$p_k(t) := u_{-t} n^-_{w_k} u_t = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + tw_k & w_k \\ -t^2 w_k & 1 - tw_k \end{pmatrix},$$

and $g_k = p_k(s_k)$.

Proposition 8.6. *There are positive constants $c_2 = c_2(\psi)$ and $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(\psi)$ such that for all $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$ and all $k \gg 1$,*

$$\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(y_k u_t) dt \geq c_2 \cdot \epsilon \int_0^{s_k} \psi(y_k u_t) dt,$$

where $y_k = y_k(\ell, \epsilon)$ is as in Proposition 8.5.

Proof. There is a constant $c > 0$ (independent of ϵ) such that $|p_k(t) g_k^{-1}| < c\epsilon$ for all $t \in [(1-\epsilon)s_k, s_k]$. Hence for all $\ell \gg 1$ (independent of ϵ), we have $p_k(t) \in \mathcal{O}$ for all $t \in [0, s_k]$.

Claim (1): For some constant $b_1 > 0$, independent of ϵ, we have for all $k \gg 1$,

$$\int_0^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t) dt \geq b_1 \int_0^{s_k} \psi(y_k u_t) dt. \tag{23}$$

By the definition of K_ψ and K'_ψ, since $y_k u_t \in x_k u_t \mathcal{O}$, we have $\chi_{K'_\psi}(y_k u_t) \leq \chi_{K_\psi}(x_k u_t)$ for all $t \in [0, s_k]$. In particular we have

$$\int_0^{s_k} \chi_{K_\psi}(x_k u_t) dt \geq \int_0^{s_k} \chi_{K'_\psi}(y_k u_t) dt.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\int_0^{s_k} \psi(y_k u_t) dt = \frac{\mu_{y_k}(\psi)}{\mu_{y_k}(\chi_{K'_\psi})} \int_0^{s_k} \chi_{K'_\psi}(y_k u_t) dt + a_{x_k}(\psi, s_k) \int_0^{s_k} \chi_{K'_\psi}(x_k u_t) dt$$

$$\int_0^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t) dt = \frac{\mu_{x_k}(\psi)}{\mu_{x_k}(\chi_{K_\psi})} \int_0^{s_k} \chi_{K_\psi}(x_k u_t) dt + a_{x_k}(\psi, s_k) \int_0^{s_k} \chi_{K_\psi}(x_k u_t) dt$$

with $\max\{|a_{x_k}(\psi, s_k)|, |a_{y_k}(\psi, s_k)|\} \leq a(s_k) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$.

As $\frac{\mu_{y_k}(\psi)}{\mu_{y_k}(\chi_{K'_\psi})}$ and $\frac{\mu_{x_k}(\psi)}{\mu_{x_k}(\chi_{K_\psi})}$ are uniformly bounded from below and above, by the choice of x_k and y_k, there exists $b > 0$ such that for all large $k \gg 1$,

$$\int_0^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t) dt \geq b \int_0^{s_k} \chi_{K_\psi}(x_k u_t) dt \geq b \int_0^{s_k} \chi_{K'_\psi}(y_k u_t) dt \geq b^2 \int_0^{s_k} \psi(y_k u_t) dt$$

finishing the proof of Claim (1).

Claim (2): For some constant $b_2 > 0$, independent of ϵ, we have for all $k \gg 1$,

$$\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \chi_{K_\psi}(x_k u_t)dt \le b_2 \int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t)dt. \tag{24}$$

By Lemma 7.8 and its proof, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \chi_{K_\psi}(x_k u_t)dt = \tfrac{\mu_{x_k}(\chi_{K_\psi})}{\mu_{x_k}(\psi)} \int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t)dt \\ + \tfrac{4(a(s_k)+a(\epsilon s_k))}{r\epsilon} \cdot \int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t)dt.\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Since $\frac{\mu_{x_k}(\psi)}{\mu_{x_k}(\chi_{K_\psi})}$ is uniformly bounded from above and below by positive constants, it suffices to take k large enough so that $(a(s_k)+a(\epsilon s_k)) \le \epsilon$ to finish the proof of Claim (2)

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(y_k u_t)dt &= \int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t p_k(t))dt \\ &\ge \int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t g_k)dt - \int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} |\psi(x_k u_t p_k(t)) - \psi(x_k u_t g_k)|dt.\end{aligned}$$

By (24), for all large k,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} |\psi(x_k u_t p_k(t)) - \psi(x_k u_t g_k)|dt &\le c_\psi \epsilon \int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \chi_{K_\psi}(x_k u_t)dt \\ &\le c_\psi b_2 \epsilon \int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t)\end{aligned}$$

where c_ψ is the Lipschitz constant of ψ. Since $g_k \in \mathcal{O}$ and hence $\frac{\mu_{x_k}(g_k\psi)}{\mu_{x_k}(\psi)}$ is uniformly bounded from above and below, we can deduce that for some $c > 1$,

$$c^{-1}\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t)dt \le \int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t g_k)dt \le c\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t)dt. \tag{26}$$

Therefore the above estimates together with (23) imply that for all k large,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(y_k u_t)dt &\ge (c^{-1} - c_\psi b_2 \epsilon)\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t)dt \\ &\ge \tfrac{(c^{-1}-c_\psi b_2\epsilon)r\epsilon}{4} \int_0^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t)dt \ge \tfrac{b_1(c^{-1}-c_\psi b_2\epsilon)r\epsilon}{4} \int_0^{s_k} \psi(y_k u_t)dt.\end{aligned}$$

Now the proposition follows with $c_2 = \frac{b_1 r}{8c}$ and $\epsilon_0 = \frac{1}{2b_2 c_\psi c}$. ☐

We will now flow x_k and y_k for the period of time $[(1-\epsilon)s_k, s_k]$. By the construction of these points, these two pieces of orbits are almost parallel and they essentially differ by g_k which is of size O(1). More importantly these "short" pieces of the orbits already become equidistributed. This will show that some ergodic component is invariant by a nontrivial element in $N-U$ and the proof can be concluded from there using standard arguments.

Fix $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\epsilon_i = \frac{1}{i} > 0$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$. We choose $s_k(\epsilon_1,\ell)$ and $x_k(\epsilon_1,\ell), y_k(\epsilon_1,\ell) \in \mathcal{G}(s_k(\epsilon_1,\ell))^+$ as in Proposition 8.5. Together with Proposition 8.6, there exists $\alpha_1 > 0$ independent of ϵ_1 and k such that

$$\int_{(1-\epsilon_1)s_k(\epsilon_1,\ell)}^{s_k(\epsilon_1,\ell)} \psi(x_k(\epsilon_1,\ell)u_t)dt \geq \alpha_1\epsilon_1 \int_0^{s_k(\epsilon_1,\ell)} \psi(x_k(\epsilon_1,\ell)u_t)dt \quad \text{and}$$

$$\int_{(1-\epsilon_1)s_k(\epsilon_1,\ell)}^{s_k(\epsilon_1,\ell)} \psi(y_k(\epsilon_1,\ell)u_t)dt \geq \alpha_1\epsilon_1 \int_0^{s_k(\epsilon_1,\ell)} \psi(y_k(\epsilon_1,\ell)u_t)dt.$$

By passing to a subsequence, we assume that $x_k(\epsilon_1,\ell) \to x_{\epsilon_1,\ell}$, and hence $y_k(\epsilon_1,\ell) \to y_{\epsilon_1,\ell}$, and $p_k(s_k(\epsilon_1,\ell))$ converges to $n_{v_{\epsilon_1,\ell}} := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ v_{\epsilon_1,\ell} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in N$ where $\frac{1}{c_1\ell} \leq |v_{\epsilon_1,\ell}| \leq \frac{c_1}{\ell}$ and $|\Im(v_{\epsilon_1,\ell})| \geq \frac{|\Re(v_{\epsilon_1,\ell})|}{c_1}$.

We proceed by induction: by dividing the interval $[(1-\epsilon_i)s_k(\epsilon_i,\ell), s_k(\epsilon_i,\ell)]$ into subintervals of length ϵ_{i+1} as in the proof of Proposition 8.5, we can find a sequence $s_k(\epsilon_{i+1},\ell)$ and subsequences $x_k(\epsilon_{i+1},\ell)$ of $x_k(\epsilon_i,\ell)$ and $y_k(\epsilon_{i+1},\ell)$ of $y_k(\epsilon_i,\ell)$ satisfying

$$\int_{(1-\epsilon_{i+1})s_k(\epsilon_{i+1},\ell)}^{s_k(\epsilon_{i+1},\ell)} \psi(x_k(\epsilon_{i+1},\ell)u_t)dt \geq \alpha_1\epsilon_{i+1} \int_0^{s_k(\epsilon_{i+1},\ell)} \psi(x_k(\epsilon_{i+1},\ell)u_t)dt;$$

$$\int_{(1-\epsilon_{i+1})s_k(\epsilon_{i+1},\ell)}^{s_k(\epsilon_{i+1},\ell)} \psi(y_k(\epsilon_{i+1},\ell)u_t)dt \geq \alpha_1\epsilon_{i+1} \int_0^{s_k(\epsilon_{i+1},\ell)} \psi(y_k(\epsilon_{i+1},\ell)u_t)dt$$

and $p_k(s_k(\epsilon_{i+1},\ell))$ converges to some element $n_{v_{\epsilon_{i+1},\ell}} := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ v_{\epsilon_{i+1},\ell} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in N$ where $\frac{1}{c_1\ell} \leq |v_{\epsilon_{i+1},\ell}| \leq \frac{c_1}{\ell}$ and $|\Im(v_{\epsilon_{i+1},\ell})| \geq \frac{|\Re(v_{\epsilon_{i+1},\ell})|}{c_1}$.

Clearly, as $i \to \infty$, we have $x_k(\epsilon_i,\ell) \to x_{\epsilon_1,\ell}$ and $y_k(\epsilon_i,\ell) \to x_{\epsilon_1,\ell}$. By passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $v_{\epsilon_i,\ell}$ converges to an element $v_\ell \in N$. Note that $\frac{1}{c_1\ell} \leq |v_\ell| \leq \frac{c_1}{\ell}$ and $|\Im(v_\ell)| \geq \frac{|\Re(v_\ell)|}{c_1}$.

Let $\ell_0 > 1$ be large enough so that $n_{v_\ell} \in \mathcal{O}$ for all $\ell > \ell_0$.

Proposition 8.7. *Let* $\ell > \ell_0$ *and set* $x_\ell := x_{\epsilon_1,\ell}$*. For any* $f \in C_c(X)$*, we have*

$$\frac{\mu_{x_\ell}(f)}{\mu_{x_\ell}(\psi)} = \frac{\mu_{x_\ell}(n_{v_\ell}.f)}{\mu_{x_\ell}(n_{v_\ell}.\psi)}.$$

Proof. We claim that there exists a constant $b > 0$ such that for each $i \geq 1$, the following holds for all $k \gg_i 1$:

$$\left| \frac{\mu_{y_k(\epsilon_i,\ell)}(f)}{\mu_{y_k(\epsilon_i,\ell)}(\psi)} - \frac{\mu_{x_k(\epsilon_i,\ell)}(n_{v_{\epsilon_i,\ell}}.f)}{\mu_{x_k(\epsilon_i,\ell)}(n_{v_{\epsilon_i,\ell}}.\psi)} \right| < b\epsilon_i. \tag{27}$$

We first deduce the proposition from this claim. Since both $y_k(\epsilon_i,\ell), x_k(\epsilon_i,\ell)$ belong to the set $E_{r/16}(\psi)$ and converge to x_ℓ, and $f,\psi \in C_c(X)$ have compact supports, $\mu_{y_k(\epsilon_i,\ell)}(f) \to \mu_{x_\ell}(f)$ and $\mu_{y_k(\epsilon_i,\ell)}(\psi) \to \mu_{x_\ell}(\psi)$ as $k \to \infty$.

Since $n_{v_{\epsilon_i,\ell}}.f$ converges to $n_{v_\ell}.f$ pointwise as $i \to \infty$ and the supports of all functions involved are contained in one fixed compact subset of X, we have $\mu_{x_k(\epsilon_i,\ell)}(n_{v_{\epsilon_i,\ell}}.f) \to \mu_{x_\ell}(n_{v_{\epsilon_i,\ell}}.f)$ as $k \to \infty$. Similarly, $\mu_{x_k(\epsilon_i,\ell)}(n_{v_{\epsilon_i,\ell}}.\psi) \to \mu_{x_\ell}(n_{v_{\epsilon_i,\ell}}.\psi)$ as $k \to \infty$. Hence (27) implies, by taking $k \to \infty$, that

$$\left| \frac{\mu_{x_\ell}(f)}{\mu_{x_\ell}(\psi)} - \frac{\mu_{x_\ell}(n_{v_{\epsilon_i,\ell}}.f)}{\mu_{x_\ell}(n_{v_{\epsilon_i,\ell}}.\psi)} \right| \le b\epsilon_i.$$

Now by taking $i \to \infty$, this proves the proposition as $\epsilon_i \to 0$.

To prove Claim (27), fixing $\epsilon := \epsilon_i$, we set $v = v_{\epsilon_i}$, $s_k = s_k(\epsilon_i)$, $x_k = x_k(\epsilon_i, \ell)$ and $y_k = y_k(\epsilon_i, \ell)$ for simplicity. By Lemma 7.8, we have, as $k \to \infty$,

$$\frac{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} f(y_k u_t)dt}{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(y_k u_t)dt} \sim \frac{\mu_{y_k}(f)}{\mu_{y_k}(\psi)}. \tag{28}$$

Since $n^+_{v_\ell} \in \mathcal{O}$, similar calculation implies that, as $k \to \infty$,

$$\frac{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} n_v \cdot f(x_k u_t)dt}{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} n_v.\psi(x_k u_t)dt} \sim \frac{\mu_{x_k}(n_v.f)}{\mu_{x_k}(n_v.\psi)}. \tag{29}$$

Therefore the claim follows if we show for all large $k \gg_i 1$,

$$\left| \frac{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} f(y_k u_t)dt}{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(y_k u_t)dt} - \frac{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} n_v.f(x_k u_t)dt}{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} n_v.\psi(x_k u_t)dt} \right| \le b\epsilon \tag{30}$$

for some $b > 0$ independent of ϵ. Let c_f and c_ψ denote the Lipschitz constants of f and ψ respectively. Hence for all $t \in [(1-\epsilon)s_k, s_k]$ and large $k \gg 1$,

$$|f(x_k u_t p_k(t)) - f(x_k u_t v_\ell)| < c_f(\epsilon + s_k^{-1}) \le 2\epsilon c_f$$

and

$$|\psi(x_k u_t p_k(t)) - \psi(x_k u_t v_\ell)| < c_\psi(\epsilon + s_k^{-1}) \le 2\epsilon c_\psi.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} f(y_k u_t)dt}{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(y_k u_t)dt} &= \frac{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} f(x_k u_t p_k(t))dt}{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t p_k(t))dt} \\ &= \frac{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} n_v \cdot f(x_k u_t)dt}{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t p_k(t))dt} + \frac{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} f(x_k u_t p_k(t)) - n_v \cdot f(x_k u_t)dt}{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t p_k(t))dt} . \end{aligned}$$

Let $K_0 = K_\psi \cup K_f$. Then the above estimate, (26) and (29) with $f = \chi_{K_0}$, imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} f(x_k u_t p_k(t)) - n_v.f(x_k u_t)dt}{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t p_k(t))dt} \right| &\le 2c_f c\epsilon \frac{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \chi_{K_0}(x_k u_t)dt}{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(x_k u_t)dt} \\ &\le 4c_f c\epsilon \frac{\mu_{x_k}(K_0)}{\mu_{x_k}(\psi)}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand we have

$$\frac{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} n_v.f(x_ku_t)dt}{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(x_ku_tp_k(t))dt} = \frac{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} n_v.f(x_ku_t)dt}{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} n_v.\psi(x_ku_t)dt} \cdot \frac{1}{1+\frac{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(x_ku_tp_k(t))-n_v.\psi(x_ku_t)dt}{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} n_v\cdot\psi(x_ku_t)dt}}.$$

Similar estimate as above gives

$$\left|\frac{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(x_ku_tp_k(t)) - n_v.\psi(x_ku_t)dt}{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} n_v.\psi(x_ku_t)dt}\right| \le 4c_\psi c\epsilon \frac{\mu_{x_k}(K_0)}{\mu_{x_k}(\psi)}.$$

All these together imply there exists a constant $c' > 0$ (depending on f and ψ but independent of ϵ) such that

$$\frac{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} f(y_ku_t)dt}{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} \psi(y_ku_t)dt} = (1+c'\epsilon)\frac{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} n_v.f(x_ku_t)dt}{\int_{(1-\epsilon)s_k}^{s_k} n_v.\psi(x_ku_t)dt} + c'\epsilon.$$

Now by (28), (29), this implies the claim (30).

□

The following proposition finishes the proof of Theorem 8.1.

Proposition 8.8. *μ_{x_0} is invariant under N.*

Proof. The set $\{n \in N : n.\mu_{x_0} = \mu_{x_0}\}$ is a closed subgroup which contains U. Let x_ℓ and v_ℓ be as in Proposition 8.7. Since $\frac{1}{c_1\ell} \le |v_\ell| \le \frac{c_1}{\ell}$ and $|\Im(v_\ell)| \ge \frac{|\Re(v_\ell)|}{c_1}$, it suffices to show that μ_{x_0} is invariant under n_{v_ℓ} for all $\ell > \ell_0$. Note that $x_\ell \in E_\rho(\psi)$. Set $N_0 := \{n \in N : x_\ell n \in E_\rho(\psi)\}$. We have for any $n \in N_0$ and $f \in C_c(X)$,

$$\frac{\mu_{x_\ell}(n.f)}{\mu_{x_\ell}(n.\psi)} = \lim_T \frac{\int_0^T f(x_\ell u_t n)dt}{\int_0^T \psi(x_\ell u_t n)dt} = \frac{\mu_{x_\ell n}(f)}{\mu_{x_\ell n}(\psi)}.$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 8.7, we have

$$\frac{\mu_{x_\ell}(n.f)}{\mu_{x_\ell}(n.\psi)} = \frac{\mu_{x_\ell n_{v_\ell}}(n.f)}{\mu_{x_\ell . n_{v_\ell}}(n.\psi)} = \frac{\mu_{x_\ell n}(n_{v_\ell}.f)}{\mu_{x_\ell . n}(n_{v_\ell}.\psi)}.$$

Therefore for any $n \in N_0$,

$$\frac{\mu_{x_\ell n}(f)}{\mu_{x_\ell n}(n_{v_\ell}.f)} = \frac{\mu_{x_\ell n}(\psi)}{\mu_{x_\ell . n}(n_{v_\ell}.\psi)} (\neq 0).$$

As $x_\ell \in E'$, it follows from the definition of E' that we can take a sequence n_m such that $x_\ell n_m \in E_\rho(\psi) \cap B(x_0, m^{-1})$ and hence $x_\ell n_m \to x_0$ as $m \to \infty$.

In particular,

$$\frac{\mu_{x_0}(f)}{\mu_{x_0}(n_{v_\ell}.f)} = \lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{\mu_{x_\ell n_m}(f)}{\mu_{x_\ell n_m}(n_{v_\ell}.f)} = \lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{\mu_{x_\ell n_m}(\psi)}{\mu_{x_\ell n_m}(n_{v_\ell}.\psi)} = \frac{\mu_{x_0}(\psi)}{\mu_{x_0}(n_{v_\ell}.\psi)}.$$

It follows that μ_{x_0} and $n_{v_\ell}.\mu_{x_0}$ are not mutually singular to each other. Hence by Lemma 8.3, $\mu_{x_0} = n_{v_\ell}.\mu_{x_0}$. □

Finally we state the following: recall the notation $m_{N_0}^{\mathrm{BR}}$ from the subsection 2.5.

Theorem 8.9. *If* U_0 *is a one-parameter unipotent subgroup of* G *and* Γ *is a convex cocompact subgroup with* $\delta > 1$*, then* $m_{N_0}^{\mathrm{BR}}$ *is* U_0*-ergodic for* $N_0 = C_G(U_0)$*.*

Proof. Let $k_0 \in K$ be such that $U_0 = k_0^{-1} U k_0$. If $B \subset X$ is a Borel subset which is U_0 invariant, then Bk_0 is U-invariant. Hence by Corollary 8.2, $m^{\mathrm{BR}}(Bk_0) = 0$ or $m^{\mathrm{BR}}(X - Bk_0) = 0$. By the definition of $m_{N_0}^{\mathrm{BR}}$, it follows that $m_{N_0}^{\mathrm{BR}}(B) = 0$ or $m_{N_0}^{\mathrm{BR}}(X - B) = 0$. ☐

9. BR IS NOT ERGODIC IF $0 < \delta \le 1$

Let Γ be a non-elementary torsion-free discrete subgroup of G. In this final section, we show that m^{BR} is never U-ergodic if Γ is convex cocompact and $\delta \le 1$.

By the Hopf decomposition theorem (cf. [12]), any ergodic measure preserving flow on a σ-finite measure space is either completely dissipative or completely conservative. In the former case, the action is isomorphic to the translation action of $\mathbb{R}$ on $\mathbb{R}$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure [1], Since Γ is non-elementary, it follows that if m^{BR} were U-ergodic, then it must be completely conservative.

We first consider Fuchian groups: Γ is called Fuchsian if it is contained in a conjugate of $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{R})$. For a Fuchsian group Γ, Γ is geometrically finite if and only if it is finitely generated.

Theorem 9.1. *If* Γ *is a finitely generated Fuchsian group, then* m^{BR} *is not* U*-ergodic.*

Proof. The support of $\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}$ consists of $xn_z m_\theta$ on the unstable horospheres $H^+(x)$ based on $\Lambda(\Gamma)$, i.e., $x \in G$ with $x^- \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$, $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and $m_\theta \in M$. As Γ is Fuchsian, the convex hull of $\Lambda(\Gamma)$ is contained in a geodesic plane, say, H, preserved by Γ. Let d denote a right K-invariant and left G-invariant metric on G. Then $xn_z m_\theta u_t = xn_{z+te^{i\theta}} m_\theta$ and hence $d(xn_z m_\theta u_t, H) = d(xn_{z+te^{i\theta}}, H) \to \infty$ as $t \to \infty$, except for two directions of θ parallel to H. Since H is Γ-invariant, we have $d(\gamma x n_{z+te^{i\theta}}, H) = d(xn_{z+te^{i\theta}}, H)$ for any $\gamma \in \Gamma$. Therefore for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and θ not parallel to H, $\Gamma\backslash\Gamma x n_z m_\theta u_t \to \infty$. This implies that almost all m^{BR}-points $w \in X$, wu_t goes to ∞ as $t \to \infty$. Therefore m^{BR} cannot be completely conservative for the U action and hence is not U-ergodic. ☐

To prove the non-ergodicity in the remaining cases we begin by recalling some standard facts. For a 1-set Λ in the plane (see 6.1 for the definition), Λ is called purely unrectifiable if $\mathcal{H}^1(\Lambda \cap \mathcal{C}) = 0$ for every rectifiable curve $\mathcal{C}$. We will use the following:

Theorem 9.2. *(cf.* [9, Theorem 6.4] *or* [22]*) If $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ has Hausdorff dimension $\delta \le 1$, then the orthogonal projection of Λ on almost every direction has also Hausdorff dimension δ. Moreover if $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a 1-set which is purely unrectifiable, then the orthogonal projection of Λ on almost every direction has zero Lebesgue length.*

Our proof in the non-Fuchsian case follows much the same philosophy that the BR measure and the BMS measure are very closely related. To be more precise, Theorem 9.2 and the definition of the BMS-measure imply that the BMS measure is not recurrent when $0 < \delta < 1$. We will use this fact to show somewhat weaker non-recurrence holds for the BR measure. The following makes this more precise.

Definition 9.3. A measure preserving flow u_t on a σ-finite measure space (X, μ) is called *strongly recurrent* if for any two measurable subsets A_1, A_2 with $\mu(A_i) > 0$ we have $\{t : xu_t \in A_2\}$ is unbounded for μ-a.e. $x \in A_1$.

Note that by the Hopf ratio ergodic theorem, any conservative, ergodic measure preserving flow is strongly recurrent. In particular since Γ is non-elementary, it follows that if m^{BR} were U-ergodic, then it must be strongly recurrent.

Theorem 9.4. *Let Γ be convex cocompact. Suppose either that $0 < \delta < 1$ or that $\Lambda(\Gamma)$ is a purely unrectifiable 1-set. Then the action of $U = \{u_t\}$ on $X = \Gamma\backslash G$ is not strongly recurrent for m^{BR}. In particular m^{BR} is not U-ergodic.*

Proof. We will prove this by contradiction. So let us assume that the action of U is strongly recurrent. We fix a BMS box $E = x_0 B_\rho$ in X with small $0 < \rho \ll 1$. We claim that there exists a Borel subset E' of $E \cap \operatorname{supp}(m^{\mathrm{BR}})$ with $m^{\mathrm{BR}}(E - E') = 0$ such that for any $x \in E'$, $\{t \in \mathbb{R} : xnu_t \in E\}$ is unbounded for almost all $n \in N$ (with respect to the Lebesgue measure of N).

To show this, for any $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\epsilon(\ell) = \epsilon(\ell, E) > 0$ be chosen so that if we let $B_\ell = N^-_{\epsilon(\ell)} A_{\epsilon(\ell)} N_\ell M$, then the map $b \mapsto xgb$ is injective on B_ℓ for all $x \in E$ and all g in the ρ-neighborhood of e in G. This is possible as Γ does not contain any parabolic element. Recalling the notation $T_{\epsilon(\ell)} = N^-_{\epsilon(\ell)} A_{\epsilon(\ell)} M$, let $\{x_j T_{\epsilon(\ell)} N_{\epsilon(\ell)} : j \in J_\ell\}$ be a finite cover of E. Then the assumption on the strong recurrence and the Fubini theorem imply that for any $j \in J_\ell$ and almost every $x \in x_j T_{\epsilon(\ell)} N_{\epsilon(\ell)}$, we have that for almost every $n \in N_\ell$, the set $\{t : xnu_t \in E\}$ is unbounded. Hence the claim follows.

Fix $x' \in E'$ and consider a sequence $x' b_\ell$ for $b_\ell = a_{\log(\rho/\ell)}$, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $(x')^- \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$ there exists a subsequence $\ell_i \to +\infty$ such that $\{x' b_{\ell_i}\}$ converges to some $y' \in \Omega$. As $(y')^+ \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$, $\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{y'}|_{y'N_\rho}$ is a positive δ-dimensional Hausdorff measure. By the assumption, Theorem 6.3 and Theorem 9.2 imply that for almost all $m_\theta \in M$ we have $p_\theta(y' N_\rho \cap \operatorname{supp}(\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{y'}))$ has zero Lebesgue length (see Section 5.1 for the notation p_θ). Since E is M-invariant and

E' is of full measure in E, we can choose $m_\theta \in M$ such that $x'm_\theta \in E'$ and $p_\theta(y'N_\rho \cap \operatorname{supp}(\mu_{y'}^{\mathrm{PS}}))$ has zero Lebesgue length. We set $x = x'm_\theta$, $x_{\ell_i} := x'b_{\ell_i}m_\theta = x'm_\theta b_{\ell_i}$ and $y = y'm_\theta$. Then $x_{\ell_i} \to y$ as $\ell_i \to +\infty$, $\{t : xnu_t \in E\}$ is unbounded for almost all $n \in N$ and the projection $p_0(yN_\rho \cap \operatorname{supp}(\mu_y^{\mathrm{PS}}))$ has zero Lebesgue length.

By the Fubini theorem, there exists a Borel subset $V' \subset V$ of co-measure zero that for each $v \in V'$, the set $\{t : xvu_t \in E\}$ is unbounded. Hence for each $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, we can find a sequence $v_j' \in V' \cap \{n_{it} : t \in [j-1, j+1]\}$. With abuse of notation, we consider v_j' as an element of $\mathbb{R}$ and write $v_j' \in [j-1, j+1]$.

Since $E = x_0B_\rho$ with $x_0^\pm \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$, the condition $gn_z \in E$ with $g^- \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$ implies that $gn_{z+w} \in \Omega$ for some $w \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|w| \le \rho$. Therefore for each $v_j' \in V'$, $xv_j'u_t \in E$ for some $t \in \mathbb{R}$ implies the existence of $w \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|w| \le \rho$ such that $xv_j'u_tn_w \in \Omega$. This in particular implies that for each $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, there exists $xv_j \in xV \cap p_0(\operatorname{supp}(\mu_x^{\mathrm{PS}}))$ with $|v_j - v_j'| \le \rho \le 1$. Note that $v_j \in [j-2, j+2]$ for each $j \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Flowing xv_j by b_ℓ, we get $xv_jb_\ell = x_\ell(b_\ell^{-1}v_jb_\ell)$. Setting $v_j^\ell := (b_\ell^{-1}v_jb_\ell) \in V$, we have

$$\tfrac{(j-2)\rho}{\ell} \le v_j^\ell \le \tfrac{(j+2)\rho}{\ell} \quad \text{and} \quad v_j^\ell \in p_0(\operatorname{supp}(\mu_{x_\ell}^{\mathrm{PS}})).$$

Therefore $x_\ell V_\rho \cap p_0(\operatorname{supp}(\mu_{x_\ell}^{\mathrm{PS}}))$ contains $x_\ell v_j^\ell$ whenever $\frac{|j\pm 2|}{\ell} < 1$.

Note that $x_{\ell_i}N_\rho \cap \operatorname{supp}(\mu_{x_{\ell_i}}^{\mathrm{PS}}) = \{x_{\ell_i}n_z : |z| < \rho, (x_{\ell_i}n_z)^+ \in \Lambda(\Gamma)\}$ and that any limit of $x_{\ell_i}n$ is of the form yn as $x_{\ell_i} \to y$. Since the visual map, $g \mapsto g^+$, is continuous and $\Lambda(\Gamma)$ is closed, it follows that the sequence of subsets $x_{\ell_i}N_\rho \cap \operatorname{supp}(\mu_{x_{\ell_i}}^{\mathrm{PS}})$ converges to $yN_\rho \cap \operatorname{supp}(\mu_y^{\mathrm{PS}})$ in the sense that if $w_i \in x_{\ell_i}N_\rho \cap \operatorname{supp}(\mu_{x_{\ell_i}}^{\mathrm{PS}})$ converges to w, then $w \in yN_\rho \cap \operatorname{supp}(\mu_y^{\mathrm{PS}})$. Therefore as $i \to \infty$, $p_0(x_{\ell_i}N_\rho \cap \operatorname{supp}(\mu_{x_{\ell_i}}^{\mathrm{PS}}))$ converges to $p_0(yN_\rho \cap \operatorname{supp}(\mu_y^{\mathrm{PS}}))$ as well in the similar sense as above. Thus we have obtained that $yV_\rho \subset p_0(\operatorname{supp}(\mu_y^{\mathrm{PS}}))$ and hence the Lebesgue length of $p(N_\rho^+ \cap \operatorname{supp}(\mu_y^{\mathrm{PS}}))$ is positive, yielding a contradiction. □

A Fuchsian group Γ is called of the first kind if $\Lambda(\Gamma)$ is a great circle and of the second kind otherwise. By Canary and Taylor [7], any torsion-free and convex cocompact group Γ with $\delta = 1$ is either a Fuchsian subgroup of the first kind or a quasi-conformal conjugation of a Fuchsian group of the second kind, and in the latter case, the limit set $\Lambda(\Gamma)$ is totally disconnected.

We learned from Chris Bishop [4] that if the limit set of a convex cocompact Kleinian group is totally disconnected, it is always purely unrectifiable. Therefore by Theorem 9.1 and Theorem 9.4, we have:

Theorem 9.5. *Let Γ be torsion-free and convex cocompact with $0 < \delta \le 1$. Then m^{BR} is not U-ergodic.*

References

[1] Jon Aaronson. An introduction to Infinite Ergodic theory. *AMS, Providence* 1997

[2] Martine Babillot. On the mixing property for hyperbolic systems. *Israel J. Math.*, 129:61–76, 2002.

[3] M. Brin. Ergodic theory of frame flows. *In Katok, A. (ed.), Ergodic theory and Dynamical systems.*, Vol 2., Proceedings, Maryland, Boston, Birkhäuser, 1982

[4] C. J. Bishop, *In private conversation.*

[5] B. H. Bowditch. Geometrical finiteness for hyperbolic groups. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 113 :245–317, 1993.

[6] Marc Burger. Horocycle flow on geometrically finite surfaces. *Duke Math. J.*, 61, 779–803, 1990.

[7] R. Canary and E. Taylor. Kleinian groups with small limit sets *Duke Math. J.* , 73, 371–381, 1994

[8] M. Einsiedler and E. Lindenstrauss. Diagonal actions on Locally homogeneous spaces. *In Homogeneous flows, moduli spaces and arithmetic*, Clay Math. Proc., 10, 155–241 (2010)

[9] K. Falconer. Fractal Geometry. *Wiley*, 2nd Ed.(2003)

[10] L. Flaminio and R. Spatzier. Geometrically finite groups, Patterson-Sullivan measures and Ratner's theorem. *Inventiones*, 99, 601-626 (1990)

[11] Michael Hochman. A Ratio ergodic theorem for multiparameter non-singular actions. *Journal of EMS*, Vol 12, 365–383 (2010)

[12] E. Hopf. Ergodentheorie. *Number 5 serii Ergebnisse der Mathematik*, 1937, Springer-Verlag

[13] X. Hu and J. Taylor. Fractal properties of products and projections of measures in $\mathbb{R}^n$. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **115** 1994, 527-544.

[14] A. Katok and R. Spatzier. Invariant measures for higher rank hyperbolic abelian actions. *Ergodic theory and Dynamical Systems.,* **16** 1996, 751–778

[15] U. Krengel. Ergodic theorems. *De Gruyter Studies in Mathematics*, vol 6, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, NY 1985

[16] E. Lindenstrauss. Invariant measures and arithmetic quantum unique ergodicity. *Annals of Math*, 163,165–219, (2006)

[17] J. L. Lions and E. Magenes. Non-Homogeneous Boundary Value problems and Applications, I. *Springer-Verlag* (1972)

[18] G. A. Margulis. On the action of unipotent groups in the space of lattices. *In Gelfand, I.M. (ed.) Proc. of the summer school on group representations. Bolyai Janos Math. Soc., Budapest, 1971.* 365-370. Budapest: Akademiai Kiado (1975).

[19] G. A. Margulis. Indefinite quadratic forms and unipotent flows on homogeneous spaces. *Proc. of "Semester on dynamical systems and ergodic theory" (Warsa 1986)* 399–409, Banach Center Publ., (23), PWN, Warsaw, (1989).

[20] J. M. Marstrand. Some fundamental geometric properties of plane sets of fractional dimension *Proc. LMS* (1954), Vol 4, 257–302

[21] Pertti Mattila. Geometry of sets and measures in Euclidean Spaces *Cambridge. Univ. Press* (1995)

[22] Pertti Mattila. Hausdorff dimension, Projections and the Fourier Transform *Publ. Math.* 3–48, (2004)

[23] Calvin Moore. Ergodicity of Flows on Homogeneous Spaces *American J. Math.* (1966), Vol 88, 154–178

[24] Hee Oh and Nimish Shah. Equidistribution and Counting for orbits of geometrically finite hyperbolic groups *Preprint*, arXive 1001.2096.

[25] Jean-Pierre Otal and Marc Peigne. Principe variationnel et groupes Kleiniens *Duke M. J*, 125, 15-44, 2004

[26] S.J. Patterson. The limit set of a Fuchsian group. *Acta Mathematica*, 136:241–273, 1976.

[27] Marc Peigné. On the Patterson-Sullivan measure of some discrete group of isometries. *Israel J. Math.*, 133:77–88, 2003.

[28] Y. Peres and W. Schlag. Smoothness of projections, Bernoulli convolutions and the dimension of exceptions, *Duke Math. J.* **102** no. 2 (2000), 193-251.

[29] Marina Ratner. On measure rigidity of unipotent subgroups of semi-simple groups. *Acta Math.* (1990), 165, 229–309.

[30] Marina Ratner. On Raghunathan's measure conjecture. *Annals of Math.* (1992), Vol 134, 545–607.

[31] Thomas Roblin. Ergodicité et équidistribution en courbure négative. *Mém. Soc. Math. Fr. (N.S.)*, (95):vi+96, 2003.

[32] Thomas Roblin. Sur l'ergodicité rationnelle et les propriétés ergodiques du flot géodésique dans les variétés hyperboliques. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, (20), 1785–1819, 2000.

[33] Daniel J. Rudolph. Ergodic behaviour of Sullivan's geometric measure on a geometrically finite hyperbolic manifold. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 2:491–512 (1983),

[34] Dennis Sullivan. The density at infinity of a discrete group of hyperbolic motions. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (50):171–202, 1979.

[35] Dennis Sullivan. Entropy, Hausdorff measures old and new, and limit sets of geometrically finite Kleinian groups. *Acta Math.*, 153(3-4):259–277, 1984.

[36] S. T. Yau. Harmonic functions on complete Riemannian manifolds *Comm. Pure. Appl. Math.,*, 28: 201-228, 1975

[37] Roland Zweimüller. Hopf's ratio ergodic theorem by inducing. *Preprint.*

Department of Mathematics, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78750
E-mail address: `amir@math.utexas.edu`

Mathematics department, Brown university, Providence, RI 02912 and Korea Institute for Advanced Study, Seoul, Korea
E-mail address: `heeoh@math.brown.edu`